THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In his recent book, *Thoughts in War-Time* (Macmillan ; 4s. 6d. net), the Archbishop of York includes an interesting essay on 'Theology To-day.' He is concerned about the divergence between older and younger theologians which was already acute and has been intensified by the outbreak of war. The essay is intended as a kind of eirenicon. It is important, he thinks, that efforts should be made on both sides towards a mutual understanding, so that a loss of spiritual fellowship may be avoided.

Accordingly he is moved to attempt a diagnosis of the situation and to offer his own theological confession and apologia. He proposes to avoid generalizations and to be shamelessly egoistic. The situation in his own earlier years was this. He and his contemporaries grew up in a stable world, a world that at any rate professed Christianity. Its standards were a Christian heritage. And even the Victorian agnostics thought it would be possible to retain Christian ethics while discarding Christian doctrine. They wished to retain Christian ethics, and took it for granted that all men of goodwill wished it also.

Along with this went a most un-Christian belief in automatic progress, an inheritance from the rationalists of the eighteenth century. Christian principles provided the standard of life ; education and scientific discovery would of themselves produce increasing conformity to that standard. Evil was regarded as a survival from a passing age. There was no need for redemption, or even for God, except as the 'tendency that makes for righteousness.'

That situation constituted the problem. What they (Dr. Temple and his contemporaries) had to do was to persuade people possessed of this outlook that they needed a Saviour, and that God is something more than a diffused essence of amiability. And this was difficult, because people were all alike sunk in a sense of security. They were dominated by a philosophy which left no room for a specific Incarnation. The idea of God was such as to preclude His ever doing anything in particular.

Dr. Temple himself approached the problem from the side of philosophy. And in *Christus Veritas* he wrote two sentences which he now quotes and underlines. One is : *I believe that a very slight touch to the intellectual balance may make the scales incline the other way.* The other is : *What is needed is the exposition of the Christian idea of God, life and the world, or, in other words, a Christo-centric metaphysics.* These sentences seem very remote to-day. The first was untrue. The second is true, but presents a task of which we now see the impracticability in anything less than many generations.

Now turn to the world in which the younger theologians have formed their habits of thought. Christian standards of conduct are challenged as radically as Christian doctrine. Society rests on no ascertainable principles, but is rather in its structure an accidental resultant of blind forces, which is in process of undermining what they have produced. The Christian view of life is repudiated by a philosophy which is far more obviously effective than Christianity ; for if a young man becomes a

Communist or a Fascist he is told very plainly what to think and do, whereas the Church leaves him with principles so general as to afford no actual guidance.

When the older theologians offer to men, fashioned by such influences, a Christian map of the world, these rightly refuse to listen. The world to-day is one of which no Christian map can be made. It must be changed by Christ into something very unlike itself before a Christian map is possible. Our task with this world is not to explain it but to convert it. Its need can be met, not by the discovery of its own immanent principle in signal manifestation through Jesus Christ, but only by the shattering impact upon its self-sufficiency and arrogance of the Son of God crucified, risen and ascended, pouring forth that explosive and disruptive energy which is the Holy Ghost.

With the war in his mind Dr. TEMPLE recalls an argument from two of his books to the effect that evil, *when overcome*, is justified, and that no justification for any one instance of evil is possible until that evil is overcome. We ourselves have to maintain our faith in God under the shadow and shock of a great evil, the war; and facile generalizations on such a matter are an affront. We must start from the fearful tension between the doctrine of the love of God and the actual facts of daily experience. When we have eliminated war it will be time to discuss whether its monstrous evil can then be seen as a 'constituent element of the absolute good.' Till then we had better get on with the job of eliminating it by the power of the gospel, which we must present, not as the clue to a universal synthesis, but as the source of world-transformation.

Theology to-day has two main tasks. They are one at the root, and those engaged on each should be concerned also with the other. But they are very different. First, there is the thinking out afresh what are the standards of life to which a society must aim at conforming, if it is to be in any sense a Christian society. We lack, and desperately need, an ethic of collective action. All the perspectives are different from those of individual relationships. But we offer no guidance whatever. And in the modern world half the decisions that men have to take are on behalf of some collective unit (like a trade union, for example). This problem appears in its acutest form in the Pacifist controversy.

But, behind and beneath all this, is the need to recover our apprehension of the gospel alike in its essence and in its impact upon ourselves and the world. We have to face this tormented world, not as offering a means to its coherence in thought and its harmony in practice, but as challenging it in the name and power of Christ crucified and risen. We shall not try to 'make sense' of everything; we shall openly proclaim that most things as they are have no sense in them at all. We shall not say that a Christian philosophy embraces all experience in a coherent scheme; we shall declare that in the gospel there is offered to men deliverance from a system of things—'the world'—which deserves the destruction that is coming upon it. We proclaim, not general progress, but salvation to them that believe.

We must dig the foundations deeper than we did in pre-war years, or in the inter-war years when we developed our pre-war thoughts. And we must be content with less imposing structures. One day theology will take up again its larger and serener task and offer to a new Christendom its Christian map of life, its Christo-centric metaphysic. But that day can hardly dawn while any who are now already concerned with theology are still alive. The task that claims our labour now is far less alluring, to light beacons in the darkness rather than to illuminate the world, but we shall be enriched by it if we are more dominated in thought and aspiration by the redeeming acts of God in Jesus Christ.

The second volume of a series on 'The Teaching of the Church' deals with *The Assurance of God*, by the Rev. Patrick C. A. CARNEGY, M.A. (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net). This is a subject of living interest, for 'it would be idle to pretend that it is easy to be assured of God in these days.' Very rightly, therefore, the bulk of the book is devoted to a survey of the certainties of God made sure through revelation, and of the reasonableness of faith.

But while, therefore, the believer must look outwards and upwards for that which will give assurance to his faith, he must also look within. For there is a witness of the Spirit in the heart, as well as the witness of the Spirit in the Word. Accordingly Mr. CARNEGY gives a chapter to 'The Mystical Experience of God' in which this obscure and somewhat controversial subject is treated with sympathy and good sense. A few notes on this aspect of assurance may be of interest.

The present century, and especially the period since the Great War, has seen a marked revival of interest in Christian Mysticism. This revival of interest has not been without its dangers. For one thing the term 'mysticism' has been applied indiscriminately to many types of experience, some of which are by no means Christian. As Dean Inge says, 'No word in our language—not even "Socialism"—has been more loosely employed than Mysticism.' Mystical experiences, therefore, must be subjected to careful scrutiny and critical study to see how far they are in accordance with Christian truth. It is also most necessary to study the methods by which the mystics attained their great objective. 'Part of the trouble has been that men have coveted the rewards of the mystics without being willing to submit themselves to the discipline which the mystics regarded as essential to achievement. This can only result in disaster. Where men want the sweets, but not the ardours of spiritual experience, they often pretend to an experience which is not really theirs because they have not paid the price.'

The core of the Christian mystical experience is the sense of an intense intimacy between the soul and God. This exalted and happy state is regarded as graciously given rather than being achieved or willed from the human side. But they who would attain to that experience must learn to seek God's presence within their own soul. The true Christian mystic holds the transcendence and immanence of God in perfect balance. As St. Augustine says, 'Thou art more inward to me than my most inward part; and higher than my highest.' Further, this joyous intimacy 'results in a conviction which bears witness to its reality by producing a certain quality of life.'

There can be no doubt that the mystics have much to support them in the teaching of the New Testament and the experience of the Apostolic Church. While in the Old Testament the emphasis on the transcendence of God is so overwhelming that His indwelling presence is hardly recognized except in some notable passages in the Psalms, it is different in the New Testament. With the Incarnation there is born a new and wonderful sense of God's nearness, and the heart of the believer becomes pre-eminently His dwelling place. 'So we find that St. Paul never tires of proclaiming the mystical union of the soul with God through the indwelling presence of Jesus Christ.' Nor does he regard this mystical experience of his as in any wise exceptional. On the contrary, he evidently looks upon it as the normal Christian experience, and his continual aim and prayer is that his converts may all attain to this experience.

At the same time the mystics have laid themselves open to serious criticism. John Wesley was a determined opponent, going so far as to say, 'the mystics are the most dangerous of Christianity's enemies. They stab it in the vitals.' He took exception to their phraseology as being 'unscriptural and affectedly mysterious,' to their spirit as being 'reserved and unsociable,' and in general to the fact that they inclined to set so little value on the fellowship of the Church and the fulfilment of the plain duties of everyday life. There is undoubtedly substance in these objections. Many mystics have sought to be 'wise above what is written,' have wrapt their experiences in cloudy verbiage, have withdrawn from fellowship and seemed strangely indifferent to 'the trivial round, the common task.' But this does not apply to the best of the mystics. 'In reality their waiting upon God is intensely active, and involves all the substance of their souls in what is at one and the same time an act of surrender, insight and love. . . . This "holy idleness," this "rest most busy," as the English mystic Walter Hilton calls it, is not apart from the active life. The contemplation of God is not an emotional luxury to be enjoyed in isolation, but a purifying experience which results in positive and practical virtues.'

How far is the mystical experience normal to the

Christian life? The mystics do not regard themselves as exceptional beings, and the New Testament assumes that believers will enjoy the indwelling presence of Christ, yet it is obvious that such experience, in any rich degree, is rare among Christian people. Perhaps not so rare as would appear from an outward survey, for many are very shy about unveiling the inner secrets of their soul's life; yet sufficiently rare to call for explanation. And the reason why so few attain to any high degree of mystical experience doubtless is that there is a price to be paid.

And what is that price? It is to tread the 'Mystic Way' through purification and illumination to union with God. 'It is at the stage of purification that the real costliness of the Mystic Way makes itself most felt. The first step of all must be the cultivation of the spirit of detachment. Man cannot come to his true self, or discover the meaning of life, until he has learnt to stand apart from those things which entangle him and prevent him from understanding the nature of his existence.' But this is no easy task. To mortify sinful desires, impulses, and passions seems to many as bitter as a death in life, and the Mystic Way seems to lead into a barren wilderness where all life withers and where 'no birds sing.' But this is a complete misapprehension. The Mystic Way leads to life through death, not to a death in life.

It is here particularly that the mystics have a message for the world to-day. They stand for the truth that 'pain and purification go hand in hand.' Only a shallow view of God's holiness allows us to think of sin as being easily and painlessly purged. 'The mystics are realists. Whatever path a man follows, sooner or later he must face the sin and sorrow that are in the world. The mystics do not pretend that the problem does not exist; they do not run away from it and make their religion a refuge from reality. They know that no man can be dead to sin unless he shares God's hatred of sin and love of goodness. They face with unflinching gaze the causes of the world's disorder and their own sinful share in it. They desire to suffer because they are lovers and refuse to shrink from the sufferings which their Beloved has endured, and they face the pains and penalties of love with the conviction that on Calvary the redeeming power of suffering was revealed.'

Professor William Ernest HOCKING, of Harvard, is well known on this side of the Atlantic for his interest in the ultimate problems of the world and of human destiny, and in particular for the original development he has given, from a standpoint of mystical idealism, to the philosophies of William James and Josiah Royce. But he is not so well known, on this side of the Atlantic at least, for his interest in the subject of Christian missions.

During 1931–32 as chairman of the 'Commission of Appraisal' of the 'Laymen's Inquiry' he went to India, China, and Japan in order to study the working of certain Protestant missions. The Report of the Commission was published in the autumn of 1932 under the title, 'Rethinking Missions.' Dr. HOCKING'S special field of investigation was the indigenous religions, and in his recently published Hibbert Lectures there are many specific illustrations which are the outcome of his experiences in the Far East.

The book to which we refer, *Living Religions and a World Faith* (Allen and Unwin; 10s. net), contains chapters on 'Religion and Religions' and 'Some Characteristics of Oriental Religions,' and enquires in what sense a world faith is to be sought for, to what extent it now exists, and what ground there is for considering that Christianity is now, or may become, such a faith. But the chapter to which we here call attention is that on 'Ways to a World Faith,' or the various methods by which a world faith is promoted.

The first is 'The Way of Radical Displacement.' This is the natural method of the missionary consciousness. It bids the convert be done with the old allegiance and take on the new one. The attitude towards the old allegiance is not one of compromise but of conquest. The new religion may be unable to conquer except in love, but in love it intends to conquer.

This is a logical and necessary method if we presuppose (1) that there is a special revelation, an explicit word of God to certain persons; (2) that this word reveals what could never otherwise be known, a particular act of God's will announcing a plan of salvation; (3) that the alternative is eternal punishment or eternal death for all those who do not take this way; (4) that God has referred to us as human messengers the task of warning mankind of its danger and of its one way of escape.

Dr. Hocking dwells on the great advantages of this method, but in the handling of its presuppositions he shows himself to be largely out of sympathy with it, as readers of 'Rethinking Missions' would anticipate. However, presuppositions (3) and (4) are laid down by himself, and do not appear to be vital to 'The Way of Radical Displacement.' As for his presuppositions (1) and (2), he is hardly justified in holding Barthian irrationalism to be the necessary basis of the doctrine of special revelation, or hardly accurate in describing the idea of a divine plan, wholly unimaginable to man, as an 'ingenious invention' of St. Paul.

The second is 'The Way of Synthesis.' Here certain elements of other religions are incorporated with one's own religion. It is an aspect of Liberalism, as being unwilling to condem as evil what is good in other faiths.

This method has dangers, such as compromise through over-accommodation or purely romantic appreciation, but has not truth its imperative 'both-and' as well as its imperative 'either-or'? There is a legitimate synthesis, and its criteria are individuality, organic unity, consistency. The religion which grows by accretion must retain its individuality; what is added must become a part of the organism of the living religion; it must also be consistent with what was there before it. In short, what is added must be true.

The attitude of our writer appears in the statement under this head that no religion can become a religion for Asia which does not fuse the spiritual genius of Asia with that of Western Christianity; and not alone the genius of Asia, but that of each of its major great religions.

'The Way of Synthesis' leads inevitably to the third way. It may be called 'The Way of Reconception.' Just as in the natural order of experience broadening is preliminary to deepening, so is it in the spiritual order; and we are at the dawn of this new stage of spiritual deepening. 'All our judgments of the essence of Christianity contain an element of certainty, and also of uncertainty—an ingredient of hypothesis. On account of this factor of uncertainty there is a call from time to time for further induction based on wider groups of facts and on better insight into their nature.'

How does this method make for a world faith? As Synthesis is mutual, so is Reconception. At present, in the Far East, Buddhism, Christianity, and Hinduism are all attempting to restate their own essences, and at the same time to include what they regard as significant in the others. This makes for a growing resemblance among religions—that is, among the conceptions of the essence of Buddhism, Christianity, and Hinduism that emerge.

The process of the search for essences needs a new institution, according to Dr. Hocking. Though Reconception is always going on, it requires for its favourable pursuit an institution widely different from the usual type of Protestant mission—not to supplant that mission, but to supplement it. The mission is set for teaching and activity; this institution must be set also for learning and leisurely study, for give and take with the thought and feeling of a nation and a world.

There seems to be little doubt but that the views of this American thinker, if endorsed by the Christian churches, would cut the nerve of their missionary effort, but he is confident that the new institution here proposed has a great future before it: 'In time, I foresee a chain of such centres set round the world, hospitable to qualified enquirers, and contributing—as centres of art contribute to the life of art—to sustain the continuing enterprise of reconceiving religion through world culture, and world culture through religion.'

Constructive Theology.

IX. Authority in Matters of Religious Belief.

By N. P. Williams, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.

The great Conferences on the Faith and Order of Christendom held at Lausanne and Edinburgh revealed, amongst the Churches and denominations there represented, and constituting what may be called for our present purposes the non-Roman half of Christendom, a gratifying measure of agreement on the question, 'What are the fundamental ideas of the Christian faith?' even though this was coupled with considerable diversity of opinion in respect of their correct interpretation. If to this agreement be added the uniform and steadfast witness of the half of Christendom which was not represented at these conferences, that is, the Roman Communion, the *consensus* of Christendom so manifested becomes a sufficiently impressive phenomenon, even in these days of secularism and materialism. But it is to be noted that the question of the 'authority' on which these ideas are, or ought to be, held received comparatively little discussion. Yet all these various bodies of Christians, Roman and non-Roman alike, would concur in the statement that the Bible is invested with 'authority,' in the sense of being a source of reliable information about God and His will for man. Here, then, is a fixed point in which the 'constructive theologian' may find a ποῦ στῶ.

The highest estimate of the Bible as the supreme and sole authority for the contents of the Christian religion is embodied in Chillingworth's famous aphorism 'The Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants.' This position, which was the foundation of the classical Protestant scholasticism, was intelligible enough in days when the literal inerrancy and verbal inspiration of the Scriptures were taken for granted, and when the 'orthodox' (the term is used for brevity and convenience, and not in order to beg any questions) doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation were so generally accepted that they appeared to be 'proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture,' in the sense of following as conclusions from trains of syllogistic reasoning which took particular proof-texts as their premises. It is obvious that the constructive theologian of to-day could not, even if he would, make these assumptions his own. Not merely do natural science, archæology, anthropology, and historical criticism compel him to admit the presence in the sacred volume of large elements of legend, folklore, and idealized history, but his moral consciousness is stirred to revolt by such terrible stories as those of Lot's incest or Samuel's ritual murder of Agag, stories of which the inclusion in the Scriptural Canon could now only be justified as illustrative of the barbaric horrors from which revelation has delivered, or was meant to deliver, mankind. However much he may wish to continue the use of the old language about 'proving' doctrines from Scripture, he cannot project himself back into a state of mind which made it seem natural for Galileo's judges to 'prove' the geocentric cosmology from 'Joshua's moon in Ajalon,' or to the Puritan colonists of America to justify harsh treatment of its native inhabitants by the example of the massacre of the Canaanites. Still less will he wish to have recourse to the allegorical method of interpretation by which any text may be made to 'prove' anything that the interpreter desires; and he will recognize that such 'proofs' of the doctrine of the Trinity as were founded upon the story of the three men who appeared to Abraham at Mamre, or the word uttered by the Father and the descent of the Spirit on the occasion of the baptism of Christ, were not really 'proofs' at all, in any intelligible sense of the term, but rather mystical interpretations of the narratives in question, which read into them a doctrine already accepted on other grounds.

It is natural for the constructive theologian who has prepared himself for the study of the authority of the Bible by long training in historical research to regard the Scriptures primarily as an historical record, embodying in one volume the documents which narrate and illustrate the age-long process of revelation culminating in Jesus Christ. From this purely historical point of view, the authority of the Bible, interpreted in the light of modern knowledge as a collection of materials from which we can construct a reliable picture of (*a*) the preparation in history for Christ, (*b*) the life and teaching of Christ Himself, and (*c*) the development of primitive Christianity, may be said to be approximating—after a period of some uncertainty and confusion, due to the shock produced by the

discoveries of the last hundred years—to a relatively stable and assured position. But its authority, in the strictly historic sense, is not always to be construed as reliable testimony to a given set of facts; even where it purports to be this, critical research has shown that it should rather be regarded as authority for the ideas which prevailed at a given stage of the Judæo-Christian development. The writings of the Chronicler cannot be regarded as providing us with a minutely accurate account of the deeds of David and Solomon; but they constitute admirable evidence for the conceptions of ceremonial correctness entertained by the post-exilic priestly class; and it will not be an unsafe generalization if we observe that (abstracting from the cardinal events of the life of Christ) the history of the evolution of religious ideas contained in the Bible is of far greater importance, and perhaps of greater reliability, than its strictly factual narratives, those, that is, which are concerned with the doings of particular patriarchs, tribes, and kings.

It is here that the constructive theologian comes face to face with a difficulty, when he endeavours to build upon the 'historical authority,' which, as interpreted above, most reasonable persons would willingly concede to the Bible, some conception of *doctrinal* authority. The knowledge that the opinions actually held by the Jewish and Christian Churches have in fact passed through such and such successive phases does not *per se* give us any information as to which of these phases is to be regarded as the nearest approximation to ideal or transcendental truth. It is doubtless true that, in the case of the Old Testament, it is not difficult in the light of the New to distinguish those passages and documents which embody glimpses of the ever-deepening light of revelation from those which are still shadowed by the heathen darkness, into which the light of the primitive revelation to the patriarchs first came. But we do not now use these passages as 'proofs' of our most fundamental beliefs, but rather as means for deepening our spiritual and moral apprehension of truths of which we are on other grounds already convinced. We are not monotheists *because* Deutero-Isaiah puts into the mouth of Yahweh the majestic words 'I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God,'[1] nor do we believe in the resurrection of the body because the pseudonymous author of Daniel promises that 'many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt.'[2] Such sayings as these are shining milestones on the great high road of the *Præparatio evangelica* which runs through Israelitish history, leading up to the temple of Christian faith; but they are not, in a strictly logical sense, foundation-stones of that temple.

Of that temple, 'other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.'[3] He, and none other, is the primary authority for Christian belief, and the Old Testament Scriptures are precious in our eyes because 'these are they which bear witness of me.'[4] But we have still to find a secondary authority which is to give us reliable information with regard both to the contents of the teaching of Christ and to its correct interpretation. It would be agreed by all Christians that such an authority is in some sense to be found in the New Testament. But in what sense? It is, indeed, obvious that as an historical authority for the life and teaching of Christ the New Testament stands alone; the doubtful Josephus-passage,[5] and the scanty collection of *Agrapha* which is all that Resch[6] can assemble after ransacking pseudepigrapha and ancient Fathers, even when reinforced by the few 'Logia' recovered from the papyri, add nothing substantial to our knowledge of Him. But, even if we consider the New Testament merely as an historical authority, it is no longer possible to take every part of it at its face value with quite the same simple and unquestioning confidence as was practically universal amongst Christians until about a hundred years ago. If we leave the more extravagant types of criticism, *formgeschichtliche* and others, out of account, it is reasonable to claim a fairly solid *consensus* of agreement for the following statements: (1) That the Synoptic Gospels, in the main, provide reliable evidence for the beliefs that Jesus lived and died, and for the general outlines of His public ministry and teaching; (2) That the Acts give us, on the whole, a not untrue picture of the development and expansion of the nascent Church; (3) That, of the Pauline *corpus*, at least eight Epistles are the authentic work of the great Apostle whose name they bear, and contain what is for our purposes an adequate summary of his characteristic interpretation of Christianity. Here, at least, would seem to be a solid rock on which to build. But it must at the same time be borne in mind (1) that the Birth narratives are held by many, as belonging to the latest *stratum* of the evangelic record, to be of insufficient strength, considered purely as historical evidence, to bear the weight of the stupendous miracle which they record; (2) that both the

[1] Is 44^{6}. [2] Dn 12^{2}. [3] 1 Co 3^{11}. [4] Jn 5^{39}. [5] *Ant.* xviii. 3, 3.
[6] *Texte u. Unters.*, N.F. XV. 3–4.

authorship and the historical character of the Fourth Gospel are still subjects of strenuous debate; (3) that the questions whether the Pauline presentation of Christ and His Gospel is the legitimate development of, or an adventitious accretion upon, the mind of the Master Himself is still answered by different schools of critical theologians in diametrically opposite senses. Where, in this welter of open questions, can we find 'most certain warrants of holy Scripture' whereby to 'prove' the convictions that we hold?

The problem is at first sight rendered more difficult by the recognition, forced upon us by modern critical candour, that, whereas the ethical teaching given *by* Jesus has been preserved in a more or less static form (in the strings of memorized sayings eventually combined into Q, and so embodied in the Synoptic Gospels), the doctrinal teaching given *about* Him by His followers has undergone a process of evolution, in which certain phases can be clearly distinguished. The literary records of each of these phases might well, if taken severally and in isolation, form bases for differing types of Christological and theological construction. If we were to confine our consideration to the early speeches of Acts, taking them alone as authoritative, we might well be able to 'prove' an 'Adoptianist' view of Christ's Person. If we take our premises from the Epistles of St. Paul's missionary period, we may, indeed, deduce from them a much higher estimate of Jesus as 'the Lord'; even so, however, the conception of His position implied in 1 Corinthians seems to be far too subordinationistic to satisfy Nicene standards, and the prophecy 'Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom . . .'[1] seems irreconcilable with the Nicene affirmation 'Whose kingdom shall have no end.' In the Epistle to the Philippians, the attributes of 'the Lord' now connote 'equality with God,'[2] though no explanation is given as to how this conception is compatible with monotheism. Implicitly in Col 1^{15-17}, and explicitly in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel, the problem is solved by the identification of Jesus with the Logos of God, and in these latter positions we can trace clearly the beginnings of the orthodoxy of the Creeds and the Œcumenical Councils; though, even so, they can hardly be deemed in themselves strictly to necessitate the metaphysical concepts either of 'three Persons in one Essence' or of 'one Person with two Natures.' Of the three doctrines—Adoptianist, Origenist, and Nicene—which seem to be suggested by different sets of Scriptural passages, which can be said, in an absolute sense, to be 'proved' by the New Testament? It may be urged that the last-named, as emerging at a later time than the others, should be considered as the culmination of the development of which they are imperfect phases; but the New Testament itself nowhere lays down an exegetical canon to this effect, nor would such a canon be *a priori* self-evident, for the later stages of a development may represent degeneration as well as perfection. Even the New Testament, therefore, though unique as an historical authority, seems to refer us beyond itself for our ultimate doctrinal authority. 'Understandest thou what thou readest? . . . How can I, except some one shall guide me?'[3]

We may summarize the foregoing line of thought by the statement that, in the light of modern knowledge the Bible is no longer regarded as an armoury of proof-texts but as a *dossier*—a collection of sources for the history of Redemption. Bound up in this *dossier* we find material from every period of the two thousand years which it covers, characterized by every degree of moral quality, ranging from barbaric ferocity and vindictiveness to the loftiest spirituality, and exhibiting the great ideas of our religion in process of evolution, not in finished form, embodied in imperfect and tentative versions which are not always harmonious one with the other. It is natural, under these conditions, to speak of the Bible as containing, rather than as being, the Word of God. We do not so much 'prove' our doctrines from it, in the sense of scholastic or mathematical demonstration, but rather, already holding those doctrines, go to the Bible for historical information concerning their genesis, for assurance that they were actually held in embryonic form by the saints and friends of God, and for the consolation and spiritual exaltation which are to be derived from meditation upon their most perfect literary embodiments. If this view appears to any reader so unfamiliar as to be paradoxical, let him consider the attitude of modern orthodox scholars to the Gospel narratives of our Lord's Birth. Few would claim that their belief in the supernatural character of that Birth was based as directly and exclusively upon the early chapters of Matthew and Luke as the belief in Hannibal's passage of the Alps is based upon the narratives of Livy or Polybius; but, already believing on other grounds in the virginal conception, they are then able to approach the 'Gospel of the Infancy' with confidence in its generally veridical character (though this does not exclude the application of a strictly objective criticism to

[1] 1 Co 15^{24}. [2] Ph 2^{6}. [3] Ac 8^{31}.

such subordinate questions of detail as the historicity of Luke's census or Matthew's 'Star in the East') and to drink unmeasured consolation and joy from its pure, serene, and passionless pages.

But what, then, is the ultimate authority behind themselves to which the Scriptures refer us? If I am presented with the *dossier* of some vitally important series of events, I naturally inquire (if I do not already know)—Who compiled this? and can I rely upon his trustworthiness, in such a way as to be sure that he has included all the essential documents? *Prima facie*, at least—that is, before I have examined, tested, and verified its component documents—the authority beyond itself to which a *dossier* refers me is that of its compiler. Doubtless it is a conspicuous tribute to the intrinsic qualities of the Bible that for so many centuries it should have been taken for granted as authoritative, despite the fact that it contains no explanation or definition of itself, no divinely-penned preface or *imprimatur* attesting its supernatural origin or character. But, in modern times, the question of its compiler must sooner or later be raised, by any inquiring mind; and the history of the formation of the Canon of Scripture may well give us the clue to the authority of which we are in search. We shall, indeed, discover no responsible individual compiler, either in the case of the Old Testament or of the New; for each of these Canons came into being by slow crystallization within the general diffused mind of the Church, the former during its Jewish and the latter during its Christian phase. In both cases, the motive, conscious or unconscious, which moved that diffused mind to select, from the mass of literature which it had from time to time produced, certain documents, which it recognized as containing the purest, most authentic and 'inspired' formulation of its own fundamental ideas, was that of self-preservation. The Law and the Prophets came to be canonized, after Israel's political sovereignty had been extinguished and prophecy had ceased, in order to conserve the life of the scattered nation and safeguard it from absorption into heathendom by embalming in written form the essentials of its worship and faith, that is, of the real, though imperfect, revelation with which it had been entrusted. So also, in the second half of the second century of our era, after the coming of the completed revelation, the Christian Church, after living for a hundred years with no 'Bible' other than the Jewish Scriptures, was led to bind up with these a selection of the writings of its own greatest men, and to ascribe to them the same inspiration and authority as it recognized in the Law and the Prophets, in order to protect its own character and the fundamental ideas of its faith against the vast, creeping, impalpable menace of Gnosticism. And in both cases the type of authority ascribed to the contents of each Canon, when first formed, would seem to have been primarily historical; the collection of sacred books constituted a kind of photograph of the revelation in its earliest form, held by its primitive recipients and depositaries, and this photograph was used to vindicate the identity and continuity of the revelation as proclaimed by the later Church with the revelation as it had been given in the beginning. So the Jewish Scriptures could be used by the orthodox Jew against Hellenizing Sadducees, to show that the austere version of Judaism which he maintained, and which excluded this or that pagan corruption, was identical with the word which God had revealed in the beginning, which also excluded the same corruptions; and the Scriptures of the New Covenant were canonized in order that they might demonstrate the continuity and identity of the Christian faith as held by the Church of the second century with the Gospel proclaimed by Christ and His Apostles, as against the Gnostic claim that the true version of Christ's teaching was a mass of theosophic lore, transmitted by a secret succession of adepts. In much the same way the traveller on the Continent, whose identity is challenged, produces the little photograph inserted into his passport in order to show, by a comparison of it with his own features, that he is the person whose name is mentioned in the passport. If the traveller happens to be the possessor of a great estate, he can prove by means of the inset photograph that he is the person who is entitled to the benefits of the estate; but the passport does not *propria vi* confer the estate upon him, for he was, presumably, in possession of it before he procured the passport. The Christian Church did not derive its faith from the New Testament (for it existed, and preached the Gospel, before a line of the New Testament was written), but directly from Christ and His first followers; nevertheless it canonized the chief surviving writings of those first followers in order to prove that the faith which it preached at the end of the second century was the same as that which He and they had proclaimed before the middle of the first.

It is, from one point of view, not unfair to describe the Bible as the history of the people of God: at any rate, the sacred community is always present in or presupposed by every page, as the permanent background of the changing flow of events. It was to this people, and not primarily to any written document, that the 'oracles of

God'[1] were in the beginning entrusted; it was in its bosom that the Christ was born, and through its mediation (after it had assumed its new, potentially universal or catholic form) that the Apostle 'received of the Lord that which,' later, he 'also handed on to'[2] his Gentile converts. The Greek word which he uses for 'to hand on,' παραδίδοναι, suggests its derivative verbal substantive, παράδοσις, generally Englished as 'tradition': and St. Paul has no scruple about describing his own teaching as 'the traditions' (1 Co 11^2, 2 Th 2^{15} 3^6).[3] The term 'tradition' may arouse antagonistic reactions: and assuredly no Christian theologian should use it without remembering that the word 'tradition' appears in the Gospels only as the object of a withering condemnation, called forth by the Halakhic casuistry of the scribes. Yet *abusus rei non tollit usum*; and if it be understood that, in a Christian context, the word refers to nothing other than the continuous, corporate mind and memory of the people of God, still bearing the indelible impressions made by the great redemptive acts which that people has witnessed, from Sinai down to Calvary and Olivet, the idea of a central 'tradition' which preserves the Word of God (amidst whatever temporary accretions or obscurations) instead of 'making it of none effect,' will not appear impossible. Certainly the central tradition of the Christian Church exists as a pædagogic factor, as the psychological cause of belief: for each one of us, as a child, learnt his Christian faith in the first instance, not by deducing it for himself from a scientific study of the Bible, but through the impact upon him of the central Christian tradition, mediated through his parents, his teachers, his pastors, and all the suggestive influences of a Christian home, environment, and worship. And æsthetic appreciation, patriotism, and morality will furnish us with analogies for a psychological cause of the acceptance of certain standards which is at the same time the logical ground of those standards. It is, surely, to the invisible, yet real, weight and pressure of the central Christian tradition, rather than to an indefinite series of coincidences in the construction of inferences from the written page, that the unity of belief manifested at Lausanne and Edinburgh is due. And, whilst mere posteriority in time is in itself no guarantee that a particular phase of religious thought is more authoritative than the phases which have preceded it, the conception of the corporate mind of the people of God, slowly growing through the centuries and clarifying the fundamental ideas of its revelation under the guidance of that Spirit who leads men into all truth, will provide us with a clue to the tangled history of Christian theology and with criteria whereby 'false starts' and 'blind-alley developments' in the interpretation of the deposit of faith may be distinguished from the true and Divinely-intended course of dogmatic evolution.

Does this line of thought make the Scriptures otiose, or reduce them to the position of a mere combination of historical record and devotional anthology? Far from it. If Scripture is a photograph of the central tradition as it was when first committed to the guardianship of the people of God, then no belief or doctrine can claim to form part of that central tradition unless at least its beginnings can be discerned in Scripture: it is, therefore, on the view just outlined, as true as ever it was that 'Holy Scripture containeth' (explicitly or implicitly) 'all things necessary to salvation.' Moreover, inasmuch as the body of the Christian revelation consists in part of events and their interpretation, the history of those events can sometimes be used to refute false interpretations of them; so, for instance, the story of Gethsemane rules out Patripassianism and Monophysitism alike. In other words, whilst it may not be possible directly to 'prove' (in the sense of 'demonstrate') orthodoxy from the Scriptures by themselves, it is, at least in some cases, possible so to disprove heresy; and the disproof of all heresies with regard to a given point may constitute an indirect proof of orthodoxy, as the only remaining hypothesis.

[1] Ro 3^2. [2] 1 Co 11^{23}.

[3] It should be mentioned that the Pauline authorship of 2 Thessalonians has been questioned—in the present writer's opinion, on quite insufficient grounds.

Literature.

ANCIENT JERICHO.

The important results of Professor Garstang's excavations on this site, which have hitherto appeared in numerous reports, mainly of a technical nature, in the 'Liverpool University Annals,' have now been put into popular form and made accessible to the general reader. In *The Story of Jericho*, by John Garstang and J. B. E. Garstang (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net), we have a most interesting description of the discoveries made, beginning with the Neolithic Age, when the first Settlement took

place (*c.* 4500 B.C.), down to the Iron Age (*c.* 900–700 B.C.), when Hiel the Bethelite rebuilt part of the city in the reign of Ahab. A fascinating account, as revealed by the spade, is given of the political and economic changes that occurred in between these two periods, when the city fell under the sway successively of the Babylonians, Canaanites, Hyksos, and Egyptians, and was ultimately destroyed by the Hebrews under Joshua.

The date of the destruction, judging most carefully from the innumerable finds in the city (more than a hundred and fifty thousand pieces of pottery were examined), along with the significant discoveries made in the tombs, has been found by the excavators to lie somewhere between 1400 and 1385 B.C. This conclusion, based on irrefutable evidence, is of great importance to Old Testament history, and accords moreover with the attacks by the 'Sa-Gaz' (now known from the Ras Shamra Tablets to have been the Hebrews) on Canaan at that time, as referred to so graphically in the Amarna Letters. The invasion by the 'Sa-Gaz' was a widespread one, involving Syria as well as Palestine, and Joshua's armies probably formed the southern section of this huge immigration. The Amarna Letters from Abdi-Hiba, King of Jerusalem, are of somewhat later date and refer to events (particularly threatened attacks on Jerusalem) after Joshua's death (Jg 1^{1-21}), and hence the names of rulers are different from those in Joshua's time. The results of Dr. Garstang's excavations are thus in complete agreement with the external evidence, and place the Exodus from Egypt about 1445 B.C., as many scholars hold.

The Jericho attacked by Joshua, occupying only five acres, was surrounded by double walls, and the interesting question as to how these fell is discussed by the authors. The conclusion reached, that they were brought down by an earthquake and not by undermining, is doubtful. Ancient armies had special well-developed methods of making city walls crumble at a given signal, and probably Jericho was no exception. Nothing at least in the evidence adduced seems to contradict this view. The fissures and dislocations found in the walls may easily have been caused by one of the numerous earthquakes in Palestine within the last two thousand years. This criticism, however, is a minor one, and does not in the least affect the accuracy and reliability of the excavational results. The noteworthy fact is that, even though the story in the Book of Joshua has been embellished by later writers, the substance of it has been found to rest upon solid reality.

The book, coming from such an outstanding master of archæology, one of the greatest living experts in this domain, needs no commendation, and he has been ably assisted by J. B. E. Garstang. It will be gratefully welcomed and its valuable information prized by all interested in Old Testament problems. It is furnished with maps, illustrations, chronological tables, and a complete index.

CONFUCIUS.

Confucius, by Professor E. D. Edwards, M.A., D.Litt. (Blackie; 5s. net), is one of the series of books published under the general title of 'What Did They Teach?' Dr. Edwards, who is Professor of Chinese at London University, writes with understanding and sympathy of the great Chinese philosopher. The first chapter which deals with the 'Background of the Teaching of Confucius' gives a particularly interesting and fresh account of Ancient China and of the political and cultural history which lay behind Confucius. The second and third chapters which deal with Confucius as Man and Teacher give a clear and well-balanced picture of the sage. In her treatment of the Teaching of Confucius on Ethics, Learning and Ritual, and Politics, Dr. Edwards might with advantage have availed herself more largely of the right of generalization and interpretation of which she makes good use in the earlier chapters. To those who have steeped themselves in the study of the Analects, the quiet words of 'The Master' have a real charm and power, but those who come for the first time to the teaching of Confucius through this book may find a number of his maxims sententious or pedestrian, and may think that the frequent quotations from his works obscure rather than reveal the man. On the other hand, many will be grateful to Dr. Edwards for the way she brings together in ordered form the most significant aphorisms of Confucius. The author makes plain the basis of the philosopher's teaching, that successful, ordered life in the State and society depends on the harmonious relationship of individuals. Confucius lays the utmost stress, not on a man's rights, but on his duties. An individual is to be taught to think, not of himself as the centre of the stage, but of the rights of other men. Dr. Edwards is wise in exposing certain misconceptions commonly held in the West regarding Confucianism and Chinese thought. Ancestor-worship, for example in China, is not worship in the Western sense, but betokens a spirit of reverence. Filial duty, which many deem to be the keystone of Confucius' teaching does not occupy nearly so prominent a place in his exposition as in that of those who followed him. The frequent comparison made by Dr. Edwards between Con-

fucius and the eighteenth century English moralists is interesting and suggestive. This book should be welcomed as an interestingly-written, scholarly introduction to the teaching of the man who for two and a half thousand years has moulded the thought and life of the Chinese people.

THE WAR.

Eight eminent men have collaborated in a discussion of the source, or sources, of our present troubles, and the result is a book of intense interest and considerable value: *The Deeper Causes of the War and its Issues*, edited by Mr. Sydney E. Hooper, M.A. (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). The writers are Professor W. G. S. Adams (on Rights and Values), Professor Gilbert Murray (on Herd Instinct: for Good or Evil), Viscount Samuel (on Sowing and Reaping), Dr. W. R. Matthews (on The War and the Crisis for the Spirit of Man), Sir Richard Livingstone (on The Crisis of Civilization), Sir Richard Gregory (on Science and Humane Values), Professor Ernest Barker (on The Problem of an Order in Europe), and Sir William Beveridge (on Peace by Federation?). It is perhaps too much to say the writers collaborate. They all go their own way. Sometimes they contradict one another. Sir Richard Gregory, for example, commits himself to the preposterous statement (p. 125), that 'there are no absolute ethical standards'; while on a later page Professor Barker cites as 'the radical and ultimate cause' of the war 'the denial and rejection of a universal norm of morality as well for individual and social life as for international relations.' But, of course, they were not meant to agree in everything. In the main issue they do all agree, and they present it from different standpoints and with varying degrees of ability and persuasiveness. The essay of Dr. Gilbert Murray is outstanding. It ought to be issued separately as a pamphlet. He quotes the Prime Minister's words of September 3rd: 'It is the evil things we are fighting against—brute force, bad faith, oppression and persecution; and against them I am certain that the right will prevail.' And with this text he has written one of the ablest and most devastating analyses of the present situation to be found anywhere. But all the essays are good and enlightening (except one!), and the book ought to have a wide influence in clarifying the minds of intelligent people.

DR. OLDHAM ON THE CHRISTIAN MIND.

The Resurrection of Christendom—the appropriateness of this title might be questioned, inasmuch as it suggests the restoration of something which we have already possessed, and lost, whereas Dr. Oldham's main contention is that Christianity has never yet built a satisfactory construction upon the foundation which is given to us in Christ. But his meaning is clear, and he develops it with great skill and emphasis, with perhaps occasionally insufficient discrimination between the platitudinous and the vitally important. This little book deals with great themes, but the author is so hampered by lack of space that his pronouncements are apt to remain in the realm of the abstract and the general. Yet in intention he is eminently practical. He faces resolutely the challenge of world events—the centralizing of control and the dominance of impersonal forces, and over against these he stresses the necessity of the growth of a common Christian mind. The central affirmations and insights of Christianity must be rediscovered and used to create new energies which will vitalize our sick society. We must hold together the two truths that man's spirit is not of this world, and yet that in this world he is called upon to fulfil his responsibility as a child of God. Dr. Oldham envisages the coming into existence of a great 'order' of Christian laymen, not bound together by the taking of stereotyped vows, but united by conscious dedication to the cause of permeating institutions and society generally with the Christian spirit. Yet man, in Dr. Oldham's view, is self-sufficient at his peril. It is not in man to save himself or his society, Christianity is a gospel, the announcement of what has been done for, and given to, mankind, and we must recognize that there is all the difference in the world between a faith which we carry and a faith which carries us. This sustaining faith must be applied not only to the individual but to our social actions and the Christianizing of our institutions. 'For this reason,' says Dr. Oldham, 'a recall to religion must necessarily mean a return to politics'—a statement which will seem startling only if we take politics in a narrow sense altogether foreign to the author's intention.

The volume appears as one of the 'Christian News-Letter Books' (Sheldon Press; 1s. net).

SAINT CUTHBERT.

Mr. Bertram Colgrave, Reader in English in the University of Durham, is a scholarly student of Early English Church History and has published with a translation and notes the text of 'The Life of Bishop Wilfrid,' by Eddius Stephanus. There appears now from his pen *Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert* (Cambridge University Press; 21s. net), being the texts with translations and notes of the chief authorities for the life of this saint. These

are the Life written by an anonymous Monk of Lindisfarne and Bede's Prose Life; and it was a happy thought to edit both Lives and publish them in a single volume. For the relation of Bede's Prose Life to the Anonymous Life is one of great interest and a comparative study throws a clear light on Bede's method as an historian. Bede's prose version, like his earlier metrical version, is based upon the Anonymous Life, but it both fills out the concise account of the unknown monk of Lindisfarne and gives extra information; and it is noteworthy that while it draws freely upon the material of its predecessor, it does not reproduce its exact language.

In these Lives an impression of reality is obtained which, as the Editor truly says, is generally missing from the typical saint's life. 'We get details in each of them of the daily life of the monk, much slighter it is true than we could have wished, but sufficient to enable us to construct some sort of a picture of the daily round of worship and work, the chapter meetings, the midday rest, the simple meals, the dress, the constant evangelistic journeys, the visits of guests, the hermit life to which occasionally the more saintly ones aspired, the burial rites and the elevation of the "relics." And the picture of the saint himself which the Anonymous Life gradually builds up is enlarged and illustrated in Bede's more graphic representation.'

We have nothing but praise for this work of erudition and scholarship. The introductory material places St. Cuthbert in his historical setting, and furnishes a satisfying account of the Manuscripts of both lives. The texts of the Lives are carefully presented in the original Latin, with the translations on the opposite pages. The Notes and the Index are all that one need desire, the former being documented with care and precision.

The Rev. Frank H. Ballard has published a most timely book with the title, *Does War Shake Faith?* (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net). It contains twelve sermons all written specially to meet the needs of to-day. They are on such subjects as—'How to Maintain a Christian Spirit in Time of War'; 'The Undying Wisdom'; 'Christian Aggressiveness'; 'Religion and Reprisals'; 'Patriotism'; etc. Those who know Mr. Ballard will know that none of the subjects is treated in any way superficially. We have given one in shortened form in 'The Christian Year' this month.

An attempt is made in *Growing Up with the Bible*, by Gwen Martin-Harvey (Drummond Tract Depot, Stirling; 6d.), to suggest a series of lessons from the Bible, to cover it all in ten years, with suitable grading for the different ages. The lessons are 'suggested,' which means that the little booklet does not supply actual worked-out lessons but only a catena of passages. In other words, this is a syllabus for the intelligent teacher of Scripture. But the writer prefaces the syllabus, first by an instruction on how to teach a Bible lesson, and, secondly, by an actual example of a worked-out lesson. Suggested syllabuses are legion, and many of them have been constructed by highly skilled teachers. This effort has merits of its own, and in any case it is a praiseworthy enterprise which will doubtless help some teachers and would richly help many mothers if they could be induced to use it.

For those who wish to know the real story of Tischendorf's life and the facts regarding his finding of the *Codex Sinaiticus*, in a form which makes fascinating reading, we commend *Search on Sinai* (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net), by the famous discoverer's son-in-law, Dr. Ludwig Schneller, translated from the original by Dorothee Schröder. The marvellous story of the finding has been told many times before, but in this volume we have the authentic facts, which should be of absorbing interest for all Christian people. The efforts of Tischendorf's predecessors in this field, such as Bengel, Wetstein, Bentley, Lachmann, and other scholars to get back to the earliest text of the New Testament seem imperfect and almost insignificant compared with the untiring perseverance and vitality of mind that this devout scholar manifested, to say nothing of his thrilling adventures. Even though he had done nothing more than discover, publish, and scientifically edit the *Codex*, his work will always be mentioned with the greatest appreciation in the history of New Testament studies. The book, giving as it does the true story of his wonderful exertions in the search for the ancient manuscript, is extremely important and valuable. It would have been a thousand pities if the story had disappeared from human memory. All who are interested in the New Testament text, especially in the earliest form known to the Church (in the time of Irenæus, A.D. 125–202), should secure this little volume, which is well written and beautifully illustrated.

When popular novelists and stars in various firmaments turn aside to give the public their views on religion the result is very dismal as a rule. But there are exceptions to every rule, and here is one. Miss Dorothy L. Sayers, the well-known writer of detective stories, in *Begin Here: A War-Time*

Essay (Gollancz ; 6s. net), has given a very sane and interesting survey of the forces which have moulded the modern world and led the nations into the dire straits in which we now find ourselves. She has no specific remedies to offer, but her main thesis is that man is more than a merely economic or political entity. In his wholeness he is a spiritual being, and we must recover the spiritual view of life ere it can be well with the nations. Miss Sayers, writing from a definitely Christian point of view, has given us a book that is at once wise, courageous and helpful.

During the war a service of intercession of an informal character is being held each week-day in the Chapel of the Manchester Regiment in Manchester Cathedral. The service is conducted by the Cathedral clergy, and a selection of the forms used has been published with the title *Manchester Cathedral Intercessions* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 1s. 6d.). They are mainly by Canon Peter Green, and those who have been made acquainted with his mind by former publications will expect, what is actually the case, that all these services are characterized equally by their informality and spirituality. Prayer-book collects are largely used, but they are only one element in services which are often quite unliturgical, and always pointed and helpful.

The Archbishop of York's *Thoughts in War-Time* (Macmillan ; 4s. 6d. net) will command respect and consideration, both because of his great ability and because of the fine spirit in which he considers the problems of our time. Dr. Temple comes to the consideration of these problems from the philosophical angle, and this standpoint is always more or less in the background. But the determining factor in the end in every case is the Cross and victory of Christ. This is finely illustrated in his two brief papers on ' Prayer in War-Time.' But it is equally present in the attitude Dr. Temple adopts towards broad questions like the war aims and peace aims of the allies, the claim of Pacifism, and the right bearing of the Christian citizen towards God, towards war and towards his, and our, enemies. It is highly improbable that so provocative a writer (in the worthy sense) will obtain general agreement with all his contentions. Is it true, for example, that God calls some people to be Pacifists, giving them a ' special vocation ' to bear their witness ? Is it true that it is ' far better not to pray for victory at all ' ? Even if we have a good conscience about the main facts at issue ? But, of course, no one, even one so eminent as an Archbishop and so able as Dr. Temple, can deal with live problems like those that arise out of war without stirring up thoughts that are ' contradictious.' This book, however, is so suggestive and so Christian that no one will read it without enrichment.

The life-story of Selwyn, the pioneer Bishop of New Zealand, has often been told, but such heroic stories bear re-telling. In *George Augustus Selwyn*, by Mr. A. W. Reed (Pickering & Inglis ; 1s. 3d. net), it is retold in a brief and simple but fascinating way. Strictly speaking it is only the first half of Selwyn's life which is narrated, for Selwyn had the misfortune, as one must feel it to be, of having his missionary career broken by his appointment to a bishopric in the home country. This book of travel and adventure in early New Zealand days should delight boys and girls, and should make a very acceptable gift book.

Under the title of *Changed by Beholding* (Pickering & Inglis ; 3s. 6d. net), the Rev. Dr. Harry A. Ironside has published six addresses on various aspects of the Christian life. They are, as one would expect from the Pastor of the Moody Memorial Church, Chicago, warmly evangelical in tone, direct and urgent in their appeal, and delivered in a breezy and colloquial style. They abound in anecdotes, and the preacher does not hesitate to make use of episodes in his own private and family life to illustrate his points. These addresses will hold the attention of readers and give ample food for serious thought.

Who was Jonas Hanway ? Probably few people could answer that question. Yet he was a notable person in the eighteenth century, and did such a great work for the poor and submerged that, when he retired from an official position, George III. continued his full salary as a pension. He played an influential part in some of the great charities, such as the Foundling Hospital, the Marine Society, the Magdalen House. His writings were voluminous, and definitely guided the course of beneficent legislation. He was a ' queer fish.' As a mark of his position he kept a carriage, but he usually walked, while his driver followed in the vehicle. Being susceptible to cold, he wore three pairs of stockings. He was the first man in London to carry an umbrella. But his eccentricities were those of a fine character, and the tenor of his life was one of devotion to all benevolent causes. His life and services were worthy of celebration, and this tribute has been paid in a book, *Jonas Hanway, 1712–1786*, by Mr. John H. Hutchins (S.P.C.K. ; 8s. 6d. net), which surveys admirably social conditions in the eighteenth century and displays fully and interestingly the redemptive work of one of its most useful sons.

Anselm's 'Cur Deus Homo': A Critical Essay.

By the Reverend D. Cairns, M.A., Bridge of Allan.

The problem of all Christian Theory of the Atonement is to illuminate the necessary and rational relationship between Christ's suffering and death and the Divine forgiveness. This is Anselm's object; apart from this, as he says, all discussion of the matter is like painting a picture on water or in air.

Cur Deus Homo is one of the world's greatest books on the Atonement, and by examining it in its strength and weakness we may perhaps be able to carry on Anselm's work a stage further, for small men may learn in every sphere of knowledge, not only from the successes, but also from the failures of their great predecessors.

It seems that the present is a time which specially calls for thought on the Atonement. As Professor Macaulay says in his book, *The Death of Jesus*, 'Among the younger ministers of the Church there is a widespread and deep longing for a fresh and positive interpretation of the Cross.' Neither the traditional theories nor the moral-influence theory command their whole-hearted assent. 'Emotional reaction to a crucifix is no adequate substitute for a doctrine.' Macaulay is right. We do require a deeper understanding of the meaning of the Cross. It would not be true to the spirit of Anselm and the other great writers on the Atonement if we were to rest satisfied with one or any of their theories, while the position of eclecticism would be still more untenable.

Let us begin with a short exposition of the Anselmic theory.

All men, he says, owe to God the debt of their continual and perfect obedience. Could they pay this from hour to hour they would be able to face God without fear. But men are not perfectly obedient, and continually fall behind in their payments of what is due to God. Can these arrears in the payment of what is due ever be paid up by men's efforts? Clearly not, since they owe to God in any case the full and perfect obedience of every future hour of existence. And more than this, there is owing to God an additional debt of honour. For man insulted God when he let himself be conquered by the Devil in temptation, and the sole adequate satisfaction to God's honour would be that through the agony of death man should so conquer the Devil as to be utterly sinless, which is an achievement impossible for any born in sin.

Thus, man is under obligation to pay this impossible double debt to God, reparation for past disobedience, and reparation for insult to the Divine Honour caused by that disobedience.

Anselm goes on to ask (I. xii.) 'Whether it beseemeth God to remit sins of His mercy alone, without any due ransom being paid.' As his treatment of the nature of forgiveness is of crucial, and I think most damaging, importance for his whole theory of Atonement, I follow the argument pretty closely and fully. It is not fitting for God to remit sins by mercy alone, since to remit is not to punish, and the just treatment of unatoned sin is to punish it; if it be not punished, it is unjustly forgiven. Further, if sin be thus forgiven unpunished, the same treatment would at God's hands be dealt to sinful and sinless, which is not consistent with God. The objection may be raised that God is free and subject to no law, and so benign that nothing more benign may be imagined. Thus, the objector may continue, it appears strange for us to say that God nowise will or ought to forgive an injury done to Himself. The answer to this, says Anselm, is that God's freedom is not capricious, nor does it allow Him to do anything inconsistent with His own dignity or His own nature.

Since God cannot forgive without Atonement, the problem remains for the time being without solution.

The dilemma of the situation can be expressed thus. God desires to save man, but cannot do so save through a satisfaction for sin which man cannot make. To save man, God must have reparation made to Him, but only God can make this reparation. But the One who makes it must also be man, otherwise it is not man who makes amends. Now Christ, as a man, owed to God the same full and perfect obedience that other men owe. But, unlike all others, He paid this debt in full. Thus Death had no claim over Him, as it has over all men who sin. He would not therefore be mortal as all other men are, in the sense that they must die. But He could lay down His life, because He was omnipotent. Not being a debtor, He might give up His life for God's glory.

Now to do an injury, however slight, to Christ, would be a greater sin than all others, and the value of His Person, which would make such sin so heinous, makes the value of His life offered up far greater

than any other offering. Thus the merit of this voluntary death outweighs all the sins of men.

The conclusion of the matter is this. It is needful for the Father to recompense the Son for His great merits, and yet it is impossible; for the Son, as God, already possesses all things. On the other hand, man owes to God a debt which he cannot, and yet must pay. But if the Son should give to another that which is due to Himself, the Father could not rightly forbid Him, nor refuse it to any to whom the Son might give it. The Son *has* given this gift to men, and 'Nothing more reasonable, delightful, desirable than this could the world hear.' 'Therefore,' concludes Anselm, 'I hence conceive so great confidence, that I can scarcely express the greatness of my heart's exultant joy. For it seems to me that God could reject no human being, coming to Him in this Name' (II. xix.).

Such is Anselm's theory in brief. It is worth while noticing that it does possess something of that sublimity which a true theory of this great transaction must have. There is a genuine splendour about these last words which I have quoted, as also there is in the following words of Book II. xx. whose title is 'How great and how just is the mercy of God.' Anselm says there, 'For what can be understood as being more merciful than that God the Father should say to the sinner who was condemned to eternal torments, and who had nothing wherewith to redeem himself, "Take My only-begotten Son, and offer Him for thyself," and the Son Himself, "Take Me and redeem thyself." But they do, as it were, speak thus when they call and draw us to the Christian Faith.'

But there are in the theory defects so serious that they make it untenable.

1. In the first place, the whole transaction here represented as resulting in man's salvation is thoroughly arbitrary and external in nature. It is almost as if we were present at a commercial agreement. Why should Christ's credit be assessed as ours? His merits stand in no intimate relation to us, they are merely assessed quantitatively as being more than enough to annul all our debt.

2. Secondly, it must be maintained that the value of the notions of debt and credit with regard to the Atonement is very limited. It is true that human sin may be regarded as a debt, and man as an insolvent debtor, but to maintain these categories of legal debt and payment within the sphere of reconciliation and sonship, is highly dangerous and misleading. For to do so is to endanger the right understanding of the nature of faith, which unites the believer to Christ and to God. Surely forgiveness does not ensue as the result of a debt being paid, it comes as the result of a Divine act of grace and loving approach to man whereby he is lifted wholly out of the sphere of debt. His debt is not so much paid as forgotten and forgiven, and the whole debtor-creditor scheme is transcended. God forgives a man in Christ, and that man is no longer a debtor, not even a solvent debtor, but a son. If this were not so, the man who is justified would have the right to demand of God his acquittal from the charge of insolvency. But in so far as atonement has been accepted by man, he has passed beyond all these troubles and concerns, 'Son, all that I have is thine,' the Father says to him. It is not that in virtue of his appeal to Christ's name, God counts man as possessing a moral solvency which he does not really have—the fact is that, being united by faith with Christ, man has returned to a childlike trust in the Father, and this is the righteousness which above all things the Father desired to see in him.

Now the theory before us maintains these categories of legal debt and credit, not only in speaking of the unredeemed man, but also of the man who is justified, with the result that Anselm's understanding of the nature of faith is endangered. One may, of course, say that he has a better grasp by grace of the true nature of faith than would be permitted to him were he consistent with his theory. As far as his theory takes us, one might think that the mere citing of Christ's name and His merits would secure for man an acquittal before the throne of God. But in fact, Anselm has a much truer understanding of the nature of faith. In Book II. xiv. Boso says, 'For it seems to me that God could reject no human being coming to Him in this Name' (of Christ), and Anselm replies, 'This it is, if he approach it in the right way. But, how one ought to enter into the participation of so great a grace, and how live under it, we are taught everywhere in Holy Scripture.' Precisely! Anselm's true grasp of the nature of faith comes to him from his understanding of the Scriptures, and in spite of his theory of our debts and Christ's merits. His theory leaves little room for that close union of the believer by faith with Christ which makes faith in the New Testament so much more than the mere drawing on a bill made out in Christ's name.

There is a further danger introduced by the wide use of this category of merit. If the believer, in so far as he believes, rises above the sphere of legal merit and debt, then surely *a fortiori* such notions should not be allowed to enter into the relationships between the Persons of the Trinity. But this is

precisely what happens according to Anselm. The extreme and repellent divisions of the Penal Substitution Theory, are, it is true, avoided, the Son is not the Victim of the Father's wrath, but nevertheless, in spite of all that Anselm can say about the Father and the Son both desiring man's salvation, yet the Son forgives, the Father does not. I shall make this clear later on.

3. Thirdly, the whole theory is external to a degree, and out of relation with the life of Christ and the love shown in it. Nowhere in *Cur Deus Homo* is there any reference to any incident in Christ's life or His Passion, save the statement that He was the Son of Mary, the Son of God, and sinless. The nature of His calling, His acts, His words, His truth to His calling, His struggle to the death with the human sin about Him, His revelation of God's love in that suffering, all these things are omitted. Only the fact of His death is considered of value. One might gather that had Jesus died as an infant in His mother's arms, the Atonement would have been equally well secured as far as Anselm's theory is concerned.

But we must go further, and say that not only does Anselm's theory leave an utterly inadequate place for the love of God as expressed in the Atonement, but we must also assert that Anselm himself has a very inadequate conception of the Divine Love, and that this is proved by a singularly interesting passage in Book I. viii.

Anselm has asked Boso, 'What is it that seems to you unreasonable in one saying that God willed those things which we believe concerning His incarnation?' and Boso answers, 'This in a word, that the Highest should stoop to such indignities, the Omnipotent do aught by so great an effort.'

Let us stop and reflect a moment here. Were he to be true to the spirit of the Gospels and the Epistles, what would Anselm answer to this? Would he not remember the passage in the Fourth Gospel concerning the foot-washing, and those words, 'And supper being ended, Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God and went to God, he riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments, and took a towel and girded himself.' And should Anselm not also have remembered the great passage in Ph. 2: 'Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, thought it not a prize to be grasped after to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross.' Remembering these and other passages, Anselm ought to have answered Boso's objection by saying that this was precisely God's glory, that He should descend in grace and take upon Him the form of a man; that this voluntary humiliation was no mere semblance, referring not merely to the human nature of Christ, but quite incontestably to the Immortal and pre-existent Son.

But what answer does Anselm make to Boso in fact? He says, 'Wherefore, when we say that God endured humiliation and infirmity, we understand this not according to the sublimity of the impassible Nature, but according to the infirmity of the Human Nature which He bore, and then no reason can be recognized as contradicting our Faith.' In short, as Bishop Aulén says in his *Christus Victor*, in the last resort for Anselm the Atonement is an act of Christ as man, the Divine Nature only being present in Him in order to make His merit of infinite value. In another passage (I. v.) Anselm says that it had to be God Who redeemed man, for if a man who was sinless had done so, then mankind would have become the slaves of that man, and not the property of God.

The real reason, however, for the faith that it was God Who redeemed and forgave man, is that it was God against Whom man had sinned, it was God from Whom man had fallen away, and therefore none other but God could forgive him, and lift him up again into communion with Himself. But, in spite of certain hints to the contrary, there is in Anselm no adequate recognition of this crucially important fact, and it is quite clear that the chief cause of this failure is the notion of debt and merit which Anselm has introduced into the internal relationships of the Holy Trinity. No one who goes wrong here, who fails to grasp the fact that the Atonement is the perfect act expressing the Divine Nature, has really reached the heart of the matter.

4. Finally, and this is perhaps the most important defect, Anselm's theory leaves no room for the Divine Forgiveness. Let us again consider what he says about it. 'It is not fitting for God to remit sins by mercy alone, since to remit is not to punish, and the just treatment of unatoned sin is to punish it. If it be not punished, it is unjustly forgiven. Further, if sin be thus forgiven unpunished, the same treatment would at God's hands be dealt to sinful and sinless, which is not consistent with God' (I. xii.).

Now, one understands the value that Anselm is here trying to conserve, and we must admit

that it is a value of the utmost importance. He means to insist that the Divine Forgiveness is not just a sheer forgetting of past sin, whether that be repented of or not. Men must not be allowed to take advantage of God, saying, 'Il me pardonnera, c'est son métier.' Were such sin to be allowed to go unpunished, the honour and justice of God and the stability of His rule would be brought to confusion.

But does not Anselm's argument prove too much? Even when atoned sin is forgiven, is not the same treatment sometimes dealt out to sinners and to sinless—that is, the sinner's penalty is remitted? But this, according to Anselm, is injustice.

Now if anything is clear with regard to forgiveness, it is this, that it implies remission, the relinquishment of a claim or right. The person injured, who had a right to his pound of flesh, scores out the debt due to him. In a sense he pays the cost, though we had no right to claim it of him that he would. The fact that he might have been severe, and yet just, and that he has chosen of his own free will to be merciful, that is the wonderful, dazzling, miraculous thing about forgiveness. A man who 'forgives' because another person paid the debt, is not forgiving or gracious at all. We do not thank him; he has received his reward. Now in II. xx. Anselm says, 'And what can be more just than that He, to Whom is owing a payment greater than all that is owing to Him, should, if this be given in payment of what is owing, remit the whole debt.' Yes, it is just, but it is not remission, and it is not forgiveness!

The fundamental weakness in Anselm's theory is that God the Father does not forgive at all; He does not, because He cannot.

Thus it appears that if the Atonement Theory is to be true to the New Testament and the facts of forgiveness, it must allow of no such division as Anselm introduces between the Father and the Son. Payment is not made by the Son to the Father. If payment is made, as it is—then in making it, they are at one, if the Son pays the cost, then the Father pays with Him in His payment. The whole transaction is an expression of the love and forgiveness of both Father and Son. Now Anselm admits that the plan behind the Atonement is shared by the Father, but he fails desperately in allowing this distinction to creep into the Trinity. The Atonement loses its character of being a wonderful miraculous self-abnegation in the Divine Nature, and becomes a price paid by the human nature of Christ to score off man's debts to the Father.

Nevertheless the theory, it must be admitted, is an attempt to do justice to something of absolutely vital importance which any theory must take account of. And if we fail to do better than Anselm, then we have no right to criticise him.

Let us see whether we can sketch the outline of a better theory of the Atonement, starting with the ideas which Anselm gives us, and trying to avoid the above-mentioned errors.

It would appear that punishment has an important place in the universe. If some way of atonement and forgiveness may be found which conserves the values that punishment conserves, and does it even better, then is it not possible that we have found the basis of a truer theory of Atonement and Divine Forgiveness?

Let us for a moment look at Anselm's conception of sin and Divine punishment. For him man's sin consists in the dishonour done to God by man's disobedience. Man owed to God the complete obedience of his rational will. Not giving it, he took from God what was God's own. Further, man's first sin and fall were an additional insult to God. By punishment God subjects the sinner unwillingly to compulsion and thus declares Himself to be his Lord (I. xiv.). What is included in this notion of honour and dishonour done to God? There is no doubt of the sense of personal affront and insult by sin, but behind these there is something perhaps even more profound. In I. xv. Anselm says that 'If Divine Wisdom did not add this (penalty), when perversity attempts to disturb the regular order of things, there would be caused in that universe, which God should rule, a certain deformity from this violated symmetry of its order, and God would seem to fail in His government. Which two consequences, being inconsistencies, are therefore impossibilities, and hence it is necessary that all sin be followed by satisfaction, or penalty.'

This singularly interesting passage, which anticipates the Theory of Grotius, shows that for Anselm the Divine Honour is something very far different from the honour of any human individual. The only power that is in a position even distantly analogous to God is the State. We men must forgive the injuries done to us. According to the commandments of Christ, 'We may not appropriate what belongs to God alone; now it appertains to no one to take vengeance, save to Him Who is Lord of all; for when earthly powers do this justly, God, by Whom they are ordained to this very end, Himself does it' (I. xii.). In short, if a Government's honour and authority must be main-

tained, there is a tenfold stronger need that God's Honour should be asserted, for it is coincident with the symmetry and order of the Universe.[1]

It should be noted that by this introduction of the satisfaction of the Divine Honour, Anselm has raised the question of sin and punishment above the level of retribution pure and simple. If retribution be regarded as the final category for interpretation of the nature of punishment, the result will be that for every sin its equivalent punishment should be meted out, irrespective of what men or other spiritual denizens of the universe thought about such punishment, and irrespective of the effect on their future actions and thoughts. But appeals such as Anselm makes to the Divine Honour and the Rule of the Universe which can only be maintained when that Honour is maintained, show that the chief consideration here is not retribution, but the future thoughts and actions of spiritual beings. For honour is a relationship between persons, and the moral order of the Universe will be satisfied not when every sin has had its appropriate equivalent punishment meted out to it, but when the spiritual beings in the Universe confess that God's rule over them has been vindicated. It is obvious that this would not happen if there were glaring inequality between sin and punishment, or if, sin and punishment being unequal, God did not take some other means to vindicate His Honour. But what I am trying to prove is that Anselm at least supplies us the grounds for maintaining that in his view punishment is not so much retributive and retrospective, as prospective and concerned with the maintenance of God's Sovereignty and the moral stability of the Universe.

So far we have not gone beyond the material supplied to us by Anselm. But now it will be worth while very briefly to enquire still further into the nature, ideally speaking, of punishment. For it is obvious that in the family and the State, punishment can be only an approximation to the ideal. For example, in the State, it is sometimes necessary that punishment should secure that men will do the right even though moved by the wrong motives, say by fear or selfishness. But ideally speaking the aim of punishment is that men should learn by its means to do the right from the right motives, from love of God and goodness, and from hatred of evil and insight into its hatefulness. Divine punishment must therefore have this purpose, the aim of securing that men should freely choose and love the right. That is, the ideal nature of punishment is educative, declaratory, revelatory, both for the individual, and for the Universe of moral beings.

Now having proceeded so far in our definition of punishment, we will agree that if some other means can be found whereby all and more than all that punishment can achieve, may be otherwise secured, then in so far as that alternative becomes available, punishment will become unnecessary. Retribution itself being no final category for the interpretation of punishment, the Honour of God and the moral order of the Universe will be safe.

It seems to me that this is the light in which we must regard the Atonement. In so far as it is accepted, and becomes a life-giving force to a man, he is passed beyond punishment and judgment, God is in the way to achieve His final purpose with him, and retributive justice has no longer a claim upon him.

If the Atonement be regarded as a declaration once and for all beyond all doubt of the love of God, and the evil of sin, and God's power to overwhelm sin, then it will do far more to make men love the right, and accord due honour to God than will the threat and actuality of punishment. But in so far as they fail to accept the Divine Love and the revelation of their sin in the Cross, men still remain under the judgment and the actuality and threat of the punishment of God.

In the Atonement made by Christ, God pays at terrible cost the payment for the sin of men. Their sins make Him suffer, but because He is perfect Love He pays the price and suffers the agony gladly, and wins the triumph by saving man. In Anselm's fine figure, the pearl which has been jerked from God's hand into the mire, is cleaned, and restored to its place among His jewels (I. xix.). But we cannot say that the price has been paid to anyone. The whole action is an action of God from beginning to end, it is at once remission, forgiveness, love, and deliverance. Such are some of the conclusions to which an analysis of the weaknesses in Anselm's great book drives at least one of its readers.

[1] Cf. Brunner's admirable discussion in *The Mediator*, ch. xvii. §§ iv. and v.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By the Reverend J. W. Jack, D.D., Glenfarg, Perthshire.

Houses, Streets, Gates.—In early Israelite times there appears to have been some system of street planning in a few of the larger Palestinian towns, such as Megiddo, Bethshean, Old Gaza (*Tell el-Ajjûl*), and a few others. At Ugarit (Ras Shamra), during the golden age of this town (fourteenth and fifteenth centuries B.C.), many of the streets were well laid out, running parallel to each other or at right angles. The houses appear to have been comfortable, with numerous rooms and excellent hygienic arrangements, and in some cases with a small interior court containing a well. In many cases a stair led up from a corner of the court to an upper storey, where the ordinary living-rooms were, while another led down either from the court or the ground rooms to a subterranean chamber used as the family burial vault. There were no such systematized arrangements, however, in Israelite towns. Indeed, it is almost paradoxical to speak of these conglomerations as towns, even when surrounded by a huge wall, or to give the name of streets to the bewildering maze of lanes twisting and turning here and there. In most cases the buildings were huddled closely together in disorder, as at Gezer. The only 'streets' were the narrow, tortuous passages, averaging not more than six to nine feet, left free between the irregular projections, and they often issued in some cul-de-sac or blind alley. Matters were even worse where the towns were enclosed with walls, for here the space was usually cramped, and the aggregation of dwellings interfered with the road immediately inside the ramparts, which was so necessary for purposes of defence. Many of the houses inhabited by privileged people stood against or actually on the wall, and their back windows looked out on the glacis. This had been the case at Jericho for over a thousand years before Joshua captured it, and it was because of the special position of Rahab's house on the wall that Joshua's spies were enabled to escape (Jos 2^{15-18}). The Jericho of Joshua's time was surrounded by two walls, an inner and an outer one, with about fifteen feet of space between them, so that Rahab's house must have perched precariously over a sort of 'tunnel' running round the city. Like the others, it must have been built of mud-brick, and thatched with palm-leaves or reeds from the Jordan fens. The Israelite architects seem to have shown considerable negligence in allowing the passage along the interior of the town walls to be obstructed with dwellings, and such undue stress from within to be placed upon the untrustworthy foundations.

The structure or 'make-up' of streets was as rudimentary as their 'lay-out.' There was no adequate paving or draining. At the very best there was nothing but a superficial covering of stones, such as has been found on the alleys and court adjoining the stables at Megiddo. There was no such thing as 'up-keep,' with the result that, in the summer heat, the dust accumulated thickly, and in winter the rains transformed the surface into large open sewers. Innumerable dogs searched for food among the street refuse, and wandered outside where they devoured the animal carcases which had been thrown there, and where a veritable pestilence often reigned (cf. Jer 22^{19}). As a rule, there were no open areas or 'squares' in a town. Indeed, the Hebrews, who designated streets by the word *ḥuṣah* (pl. *ḥuṣôth*), had no proper term for open places except *reḥôb*, which according to its etymology signifies merely an enlargement of the street, like the Greek πλατεῖα or Italian *largo* (cf. Jer 5^{1}, Neh $8^{1.\ 3.\ 16}$ R.V., where Authorized Version has 'streets'). The fact is, that in earlier towns the broad place or 'square' was situated either outside the walls or more usually just inside them. In this latter case, it was simply the 'esplanade' or level space between the principal gate and the first houses of the town. It was the usual spot for gatherings of every sort. Here the people discussed public affairs and the children played. Here was the town market where products of all kinds were bought and sold (cf. Samaria, 2 K 7^{1}). In the time of Nehemiah, one of the north gates of Jerusalem, corresponding now to the Gate of Damascus, was known as the Fish-Gate, where Tyrian dealers had their stalls and made no scruple of doing business on the Sabbath (cf. Neh $13^{15f.}$). It was in the area adjoining the town gate, too, that legal transactions took place, witnesses being easily secured from among the loafers and idlers who frequented the place. Here Boaz went in order to purchase Ruth the Moabitess and her possessions in the presence of the people (Ru 4), and here Absalom installed himself with the object of obtaining partisans (2 S 15^{2}). The squalidness of the gate area in most towns was not one whit better than

that of the streets. Refuse of every kind abounded: ashes, broken pots, kitchen waste, and other debris. We need not wonder that the unsavoury name of Dung-Gate (*Ashpôth*, Neh 2^{13}) was given to one of the gates on the south-west of Jerusalem, no doubt adjoining the spot known as *Bethsô* (*domus stercoris*) referred to by Josephus, and probably the same as the 'Gate of Potsherds' mentioned by Jeremiah (19^{2} R.V.m., cf. also Job 2^{8}). It may have been at this spot that scenes of mourning or penitence took place (cf. Is 47^{1}, Jon 3^{6}, Jer 6^{26}, Mic 1^{10}, Ezk 27^{30}), reminding us of the Homeric story of Priam who 'rolled himself in the dung' on hearing of the death of Hector (*Iliad*, XXII. 414). The names given by the Babylonians and Assyrians to their city gates were certainly more attractive or symbolic than those adopted by the Palestinians. Cf. the names of the fifteen gates of Nineveh, and the name of Babylon itself which is a transcription of the ideogram Ka. Dingir 'Gate of the gods."

Ras Shamra (Ugarit).

Europe and Palestine connected, *c.* 1900 B.C.—M. Claude F.-A. Schaeffer, who has now carried through about a dozen campaigns at Ras Shamra, describes further important discoveries in his latest report. Some of these may interest Biblical students. *First*, he has unearthed a vase, dating from the beginning of the second millennium B.C., in the shape of a hut with rounded conical roof and with a door that can be closed with a cross-bar. It so happens that this curious type of earthenware, which is unique in Syro-Palestine and indeed throughout the East, has been found in Crete, at Melos in the Aegean, in Greece, and in other places throughout Europe, including Russia, North Germany, and Italy. We have thus a further proof of the close connexion existing as far back as the days of Abraham between the western world and Palestine, probably through the intermediary of the Aegean. Ships from Crete, the Aegean, and other western centres landed their products at Tyre and Sidon for barter in Palestine and the East, while caravans from distant countries travelled south through Palestine, bringing valuable products and carrying on trade with the inhabitants.

Deadly Power of Ancient Arrows.—*Second*, in a family tomb used probably from the sixteenth century to the middle of the fourteenth, and containing a large accumulation of adult human bones, Schaeffer has found two vertebræ still joined together anatomically but pierced in between with a bronze arrow still in position. According to an X-ray examination by Dr. Jarry, the St. Germain radiologist, the point of the arrow had penetrated to the centre of the medullary canal, causing a spinal wound leading to rapid death. The discovery is interesting as showing the penetrative force of ancient arrows. There is good evidence to show that an arrow, shot from a distance of well over a hundred yards, would enter about three inches into the body. We are reminded of Ahab's death through an arrow which pierced him between the joints of his armour (1 K 22^{34}), and of Jehoram's through an arrow which smote him between the arms and went out at his heart (2 K 9^{24}).

The Arsenal and Official Archives.—*Third*, further cuneiform tablets have been discovered in the buildings to the south of the Great Hall. These date from before the pillage and fire which occurred in the town about 1350 B.C. It is possible that the military commander's quarters were here, for one of the tablets is a letter in Akkadian cuneiform from the king of Beirût to his son, who was governor of Ugarit at the time. The fortress or arsenal of the town also seems to have been located at this part, for the largest of the tablets contains a list of weapons, including bows and slings, distributed to certain soldiers whose names are given (most of these being Semitic). From an accumulation of sling-stones found near the same spot, it is evident that many of the stones hurled by ancient slingers were of fairly large size. One of the bigger kind must have completely filled the 'pouch' or hollow in the sling (called 'palm' (*kaph*) by the Hebrews, cf. 1 S 25^{29} R.V.), and a supply of them must have formed a heavy weight in the bag (cf. 1 S 17^{40}). Fresh tablets, grouped carefully together in packets of about ten, have also been unearthed in the rooms to the north of the Great Hall, and Schaeffer's view is that here at last he has lighted on the official economic and diplomatic archives of the kings of Ugarit. If so, we may receive most valuable information about Palestine at that distant age (*c.* 1400 B.C.). According to Virolleaud, there are lists giving the names of about ninety towns which formed the kingdom of Ugarit. One of the towns, Ḫalbi, is stated to have been inhabited by Sa-Gaz (or Habiru), and these are equated with the *'Iprîm* (*'Ibrîm*) or Hebrews, thus solving a problem which has long vexed Biblical scholars.[1]

The Rephaim.

From the references to the Rephaim in various passages of the Ras Shamra poems, it is clear that

[1] An article on this subject by the writer is to appear in the July issue of the *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*.

they were a group of beings who were in the service of Baal, and whose leader had the name of Raphabaal, corresponding no doubt to Raphaël, the good angel of Tobit in Jewish tradition ('one of the seven angels before the Lord'). This is quite a different signification to that given to the Rephaim in the Old Testament, where they seem to have the double meaning of: (1) an ancient extinct race of giants (cf. Gn 14^5, Dt 3^{13} R.V., etc.), the last of whom is stated to have been 'Og, king of Bashan (Dt 3^{11} R.V.); (2) disembodied spirits or 'shades' (cf. Ps 88^{10} R.V.m.: 'Shall the Rephaim arise and praise thee?'). Perhaps the latter meaning originated from the former, as Schwally long ago suggested, for the 'giants' being dead and gone were regarded as inhabitants of the underworld. Probably the Ras Shamra signification, which goes back to at least the fifteenth century B.C., is the original and correct one. According to the poems, there were not more than seven or eight Rephaim, and their activity was largely confined to the events connected with the annual appearance and disappearance of Baal, whose throne stood on the summit of a mountain in Amurru. As these servants of Baal must have left only a very vague trace in Hebrew tradition, it is easy to see how they came to be regarded by Old Testament writers as extinct giants. According to skeletal remains, there were no men of abnormal size among the aborigines of Palestine. Indeed, before the third millennium B.C. Palestine man seems to have been somewhat less in size than in later ages. Probably the Israelite tradition of giants arose from the existence of the numerous megalithic structures, especially in the Transjordan, and from the Canaanite city walls some of which were built of cyclopean masonry nearly twenty feet thick (cf. those at Aï in the Early Bronze Age). Seeing also that the Rephaim played an important rôle in the ceremonies connected with the disappearance or death of Baal, it was natural that Hebrew writers should place them among the 'manes,' and look upon them as a kind of aristocracy in Sheol, not unlike the Arab *djinns*. The Ras Shamra texts, it may be said, seem to confirm the view that the word Rephaim is derived from the Hebrew root *rāphā*, 'to heal' (cf. Raphaël, 'God heals').

The Nuzi Tablets.

Marriage Customs. — The written records discovered at Nuzi (to the south of Nineveh), many of which are of a domestic nature, throw additional light on the rules regulating marriage among the Hebrews. According to Professor Millar Burrows, of Yale, two of the tablets record the adoption or entry of young men into the house and family of their father-in-law in cases where the latter had no son. This was really the Akkadian custom of *errēbu*-marriage, according to which a young man entered (*erābu*) his wife's home, becoming legally subject to his father-in-law, and without receiving in full the ordinary powers of a husband. The arrangement was essentially a product of patriarchal society, and it explains Jacob's action in entering Laban's household when he married the daughters of the latter (Gn 29), and the restrictions and inferior position involved. It is true, Laban had sons (Gn 30^{35} 31^1 J), but these were probably born after Jacob had entered the household (they do not come on the scene till twenty years later, Gn 31^{41}). Further, the Nuzi tablets give us some illustration of the Levirate marriage in the Old Testament (Dt $25^{5\text{-}10}$), according to which a man was bound to marry the widow of his brother, if the latter died leaving no son. The Biblical reason given is so that he could raise up children to his brother, thus providing heirs for the latter's property and continuing his personal life, as it were (for a man lived through his children). But Professor Burrows points out that, according to the Babylonian tablets, there was a further important reason. The welfare of a deceased man was dependent on certain ancestral rights, such as water libations, being performed over his grave by his descendants, and if there was no son to do this important duty, the result was regarded as disastrous. This was a superstitious idea, however, which the Biblical writers seem to have wisely rejected, and hence Deuteronomy makes no reference to it.

Shoes as Legal Symbols. — According to the Hebrew law, if the surviving kinsman refused to take the widow, a formal declaration was to be made before the elders of the city, and she was to disgrace him publicly by taking off his shoe and spitting in his face (Dt 25^9). This custom, in which shoes were used in a legal and symbolic way, was common not only throughout Israel, but in other parts of the Near East, and finds illustration in some of the Nuzi Tablets. The explanation of the custom is apparent. Seeing that one enters upon the occupation of a property by treading upon it with his shoes (cf. Ps 60^8), the pulling off of the shoe indicates the intention of *not* carrying out this occupancy (cf. Ru 4^8, where the kinsman renounced his right to Ruth's property by drawing off his shoe). In other words, when any one gave up a claim or title, he took off his shoe or sandal as legal evidence (in place of a formal

deed), and handed it to the purchaser (cf. Ru 4^7; perhaps also Am 2^6 8^6). No doubt the transference of the shoe sometimes occurred without the seller receiving his full payment (perhaps no payment at all), or in order to circumvent legal obstacles, and this abuse of the custom explains the words of Samuel (1 S 12^3) in his farewell address to the people, where the Septuagint reading, which is probably the correct one, says (cf. R.V.m.): 'From whose hands have I taken a ransom and a shoe? Answer against me and I will return it' (ἐξίλασμα καὶ ὑπόδημα; ἀποκρίθητε κατ' ἐμοῦ).

Mummy of Solomon's Father-in-Law.

It is interesting to note that the black granite sarcophagus (containing a mummy case of solid silver seven feet long) of Psusennes II. (*c.* 976–947 B.C.), the last Pharaoh of the Twenty-first Dynasty (Tanites), whose daughter king Solomon married, has been discovered recently by Professor Montet of Strasbourg University at *Ṣan el-Ḥagar*, the site of the ancient city of Tanis (Biblical Zoan). We find (1 K 3^1) that 'Solomon made affinity with Pharaoh king of Egypt,' and 'he brought Pharaoh's daughter into the city of David,' until he had finished the temple of Yahweh and the palace. As Solomon commenced the temple in the fourth year of his reign (*i.e.* about 965 B.C.), the marriage must have taken place about 964 B.C. or a little later. Living and reigning not far from the Delta, Solomon would naturally be sensitive to frontier politics, and by taking Pharaoh's daughter as a wife, he would hope to retain Egypt as an ally, or at least to restrain any opposition from there. There was peace on the borders at the time, and traffickers flourished by exchanging the valued wood of Lebanon, the spices of Araby, and such-like things for the linen yarn and other products of Egypt. The Pharaoh, however, who claimed a suzerainty over Philistia, seems to have broken the peace, with the Philistines at least, by putting the city of Gezer to fire and sword (it had revolted from him), and then presenting it as a wedding gift to Solomon. This was an action which greatly benefited the latter from the commercial standpoint, for it gave him control of the great highway or trade-route from Egypt to Syria and beyond, by way of Gezer, Megiddo, and Hazor. Unfortunately, Montet found that the Pharaoh's mummy inside had been practically destroyed by the humidity of the air, and only a small quantity of bones remained, but there was a pure gold mask like Tutankhamūn's, and he found twenty-one gold bracelets, some gold necklaces and other jewellery, a pair of slippers in gold, numerous weapons, and various precious objects (some of these with valuable historical inscriptions). Tanis has long been regarded as the repository of many unknown events in Hebrew history—it is believed to have been the Avaris of the Hyksos—and for that reason the excavations being conducted there by Montet are being watched with the closest interest.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

'Quisling.'

By the Reverend A. E. Willmott,
West Ealing, London.

'Watch ye, stand fast in the faith.'—1 Co 16^{13}.

A thing is known by the name which we give it, yet there are many things which are called by names that appear to have no connexion with the thing whatsoever. We know what a mackintosh is, but why should we call it a mackintosh? If we had never known a mackintosh should we guess what it is like from its name? We learn that it is given this name because it was the name of the man who invented this particular type of garment. When we go for picnics in the summer we take not only our mackintoshes but also some sandwiches. Why call them sandwiches? Because a certain Earl of Sandwich first thought of them! Many of you wear wellingtons in the rainy season, but that word doesn't convey the idea of waterproof foot-wear, does it? Those useful articles got their name from the famous Duke of Wellington who made them popular.

Now there is a new word which is becoming current speech: it is the queer little word 'Quisling.' It doesn't sound a nice word, and it hasn't got a nice meaning! It is a word which in future will

mean 'traitor.' It is the name of a man who has recently let down his country by allowing the enemy to take possession of it. So a 'Quisling' is one who lets in the enemy and lets down his side. Whatever you do, don't be a 'Quisling'! I am sure none of you would ever do anything like that as far as your country is concerned, but what about the Kingdom of God? You belong to the great army of the Lord Jesus Christ, and there is a very subtle enemy that would like to make quislings of all of you!

There was a traitor in the days of the New Testament: his name was Judas. He let in the enemy. Do you remember how he brought the soldiers to the garden where Jesus was spending the night with His disciples? He knew all about that, and instead of defending his Master he gave Him away. Our enemy is Satan, and he comes with a host of wrong thoughts and things wanting to get into the territory that belongs to Jesus. Don't let him in! When he comes to you in beautiful disguise, as so often he does, remember that he is a great deceiver and wants to get hold of you so that he can use you to fight against your King. When you are tempted to do the wrong thing, say to yourself, 'I mustn't be a Quisling.' That is why Paul says in our text 'Watch ye': we need always to be on the look-out lest we let in the enemy.

Judas also let down his side. Have you ever wondered what the other disciples thought of Judas after he did that terrible thing? We see in the records of the Gospel what they thought of him: they refer to him as 'Judas, who let down his side'—that is what the word traitor means. How ashamed they were of him! It is the last thing you would do in your school, isn't it? Of course! So Paul says again, 'Stand fast in the faith.' You are in the army of the Eternal King, and you must see that you do not let your side down. There are many ways in which the enemy will come to you trying to induce you to do this: he will say that missing your Church service doesn't really matter; that if you should forget your prayers well don't worry about that; that you need not bother about being too particular as to what you say and what you do. He is always tempting people to become slack and careless. When he comes to you and suggests any of these things, say to yourself, 'I mustn't be a Quisling.' You are a Christian soldier in the army of the great King, and you have to fight against the cleverest foe in the world. Therefore: 'Watch ye, stand fast in the faith,' never let in the enemy and never let your side down.

What's in a Letter?

By the Reverend Lionel R. Floyd, B.A., B.D., Carshalton Beeches, Surrey.

'Ye are our epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men.'—2 Co 3^2.

Have you ever thought what a lot you can learn from a letter? First of all, you look at the envelope. What a thrill it gives you if it is addressed to you. But who is the writer of the letter? Do you recognize the handwriting, or the post mark? For, of course, it would not do to tear open the envelope and pull out the letter before you have thoroughly examined the outside.

Not for long, however, can you keep back your curiosity. Whether you recognize the handwriting or not, you really must look inside to see what the letter is about. Now suppose it was your Daddy who had received the letter. He, too, would look at the outside of the envelope, but he would not spend quite so long over it as you would. Then he would open it, and might even read it half aloud, something like this:

'Dear Sir,
I am in receipt of your letter . . .'

You would know at once that it was a business letter. If he read out:

'Dear Mr. So-and-So,
I am writing to ask . . .'

What, another begging letter! Or it might read:

'Dear So-and-So,
How are you getting along these days? . . .'

You would know that that was a letter from a friend. And you have only to look at some of the envelopes addressed to Daddy to recognize them at once. Those with a penny stamp are either circulars or bills, and I expect you think your Daddy gets far too many bills! Sometimes we grown-ups receive anonymous letters from people who have hard things to say about us, but who are afraid to sign their names. I hope you won't receive many of them.

There is another kind of letter which Daddy used to receive, and write, too, and which some of you perhaps write now and then. I think you will recognize the kind of letter at once when I say that it usually begins something like this: 'My dearest, darlingest . . .'

I have in my possession a letter which I greatly treasure. It was given to me by an old man who knew that I was interested in the writer. Some of

the older folk might recognize the address if not the style of the letter.

Westwood,
Beulah Hill,
Upper Norwood,
Jan. 31, 1881.

Dear Mr. George,

I thank you very much for collecting so diligently. Never mind if some refuse; the Lord will accept your service not according to your success but according to your desire.

God bless you evermore,
Yours heartily,

. . . . . .

Can you guess who wrote the letter, old and faded now, but the handwriting is almost like copperplate? It was written by a famous preacher, C. H. Spurgeon.

In the New Testament there are many letters written by one man, the Apostle Paul. They are open letters for all to read. What a lot they tell us about the man who wrote them, and about the One who inspired them. They are the most famous letters that have ever been written. I picture Paul pacing the room to and fro, dictating his letters to a scribe, although in one of them he says, 'Ye see how large a letter I have written unto you with mine own hand.' They are all just like Paul, the same style, the same white-hot enthusiasm, and such a consuming passion for Jesus Christ his Lord.

Once he said to his readers, 'Ye are our letter, written in our hearts, known and read of all men.' His converts were like open letters, for any one to read. We, too, are like open letters. What do people see in us? Do our actions quickly tell whose we are and whom we serve? Do our words speak forth His praise? Paul, in his letters, was never ashamed of letting people know that he belonged to Christ.

The Christian Year.

Fourth Sunday after Trinity.

Darkness and Night.

'Thou makest darkness, and it is night.'—Ps 104^{20}.

'And I will give thee the treasures of darkness.'—Is 45^{3}.

'And I said to the man who stood at the gate of the year, "Give me a light that I may tread safely into the unknown." And he replied, "Go out into the darkness, and put your hand into the Hand of God. That shall be better than light, and safer than a known way."'—Miss M. L. Haskins.

There are not many people who speak in praise of night. Men will grow eloquent on the glories of dawn or sunset, but they sink to the most dismal reflections about the hours of darkness. As little children we feared the space between the putting out of lights and the coming of sleep, and imagined all sorts of terrors to be lurking around us in a country lane, even though the stars were bright above us. And some who by the calendar have left childhood far behind have not outgrown childish fears.

It is true even of many Biblical writers. There are those in both Testaments who regard night as a special time of danger and destruction, when evil seems twenty times greater than it really is. God is light and in Him is no darkness at all. Jesus Christ is the light of the world. He came to break the power of the prince of darkness. When He died upon the Cross there was darkness over all the earth.

There are, however, some, like the Psalmist, who affirm that the night, like the day, is God's creation, and declares His glory. 'While the earth remaineth, seed-time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and *day and night* shall not cease.' And night is not mentioned as in conflict with day, any more than seed-time is in conflict with harvest. They are opposites, but opposites which complement one another.

Night is the time for rest, and without rest we cannot for long work. Rest and toil are the bass and treble of life as necessary to one another as the different instruments in an orchestra. In the early stages of the last war, munition factories were open every day; but it was soon discovered that the result was a diminished output, and a day of rest was found to be a physical necessity. In the French Revolution, men were anxious to obliterate every trace of religion and a week of ten days was tried. It lasted twelve years and was then abandoned. It is possible that one reason for the restlessness of the present world is that it has largely lost the art of relaxation. Not only has Sunday become a day of amusement, but in our great cities millions try to labour all day and live in excitement half the night. Small wonder they become jaded and irritable. One of the minor blessings of the war may be that with quiet evenings at home and more hours asleep men may get steadier nerves and more peaceful minds.

Night is frequently a time of inspiration. 'God spake unto Israel in the visions of the night.' In the day-time most of us are too busy to listen. The body is restless; the mind active. But at night, when everything is still, we relax, and the mind becomes receptive. There have been religious men who have confessed that the night has brought them into closer touch with the infinite than the day. There have been intellectual geniuses, like Descartes, who have said that their greatest discoveries have come to them in bed. They had to work it all out

the next day, but the inspiration came in the night watches. The Bible supplies a host of illustrations. It was in the night that Paul saw and heard the man from Macedonia imploring him: 'Come over into Macedonia and help us.' The incidents are too numerous to be accidental.

City-dwellers may not yet have discovered it, but the night is resplendent with beauty. Some of the most memorable experiences of beauty in my own life have been night scenes, and therefore I read with much appreciation a number of passages in Mr. F. C. Smythe's lovely little book, *The Spirit of the Hills*. He tells of nights spent in the mountains and the ineffable beauty of clouds and moon and mist. No wonder Smythe pities the man who never climbs, especially the man who never gets away from city lights and cheap and vulgar sensations. What a contrast between the youth who looks nightly up at the spangled sky and feels the wonder of vast distances, and the youth who looks nightly at the tawdry sentimentalities of the cinema. No wonder the son of Nature says with some vehemence: '*There*—there in your crowded picture houses is to be found the opium of the people.' One is not without hope that now with blackened streets even the city-dweller may discover the glories of the sky and begin to appreciate those magnificent lines in the book of Job:

> When the morning stars sang together,
> And all the sons of God shouted for joy.

But, even if all this were not true, even if the popular verdict were right and night must still stand as a symbol of sorrow and suffering, does it follow that it is evil? 'Without suffering,' says Dr. Raven in *Jesus and the Gospel of Love*, 'there would be no sympathy, without pain no discipline or compassion, without struggle no progress, without evil no forgiveness and, I think, no virtue. . . . We who have known suffering have learnt to see that without it love would be meaningless and life insipid.'

This may be hard to understand, but let us consider a few well-authenticated facts.

Any one who is familiar with the lives of the poets knows that they have 'learned in suffering what they have taught in song.' 'One of the sweetest songs in Nature is sung by the Robin Redbreast,' wrote W. H. Davies in his Introduction to Defoe's *Moll Flanders*: 'and his song is all the sweeter for being heard when the other birds are silent. But the most effective notes of the robin are not heard in his song, but at that time in autumn when he sits on a branch, alone, and does nothing but sob a few quiet notes.'

Life may be too fortunate, the liquor of life may corrupt with excess of sweetness; and for lack of that wholesome bitter of disappointment a man's heart may stagnate in an undiscerning content. How rightly did Carlyle judge when he wrote his characteristic remark about Dante: 'We will not complain of Dante's miseries: had all gone right with him as he wished it, he might have been Prior, Podestà, or whatsoever they call it, of Florence, well accepted among neighbours,—and the world had wanted one of the most notable words ever spoken or sung!' Millions more have found comfort in Matheson's 'O Love that wilt not let me go': it is not always remembered that it was born in an hour of supreme agony.

There is plenty of evidence that suffering is a condition of human progress. There is that within us which longs for ease and comfort. Yet it is the critical periods we like to read about—the time of convulsions we set our sons more particularly to study. It is in the time of turmoil when old orders are destroyed that challenging personalities arise and new orders are made. Actually civilizations arise from stress and strain: they are born of tension and pain. This has been worked out in great detail by Professor Toynbee, who expresses his conviction in the formula: 'The greater the challenge the greater the stimulus.' Which is a heartening reflection for us also for we are faced with one of the greatest ordeals in our island history. Some one has said that there is no resurrection without a crucifixion. Perhaps this is what God wants us to learn in the night of affliction. We have been thinking these many years about progress. There was a time when we were led to believe that little was necessary to attain it but education and social reform and the application of scientific inventions to common life. We find now that education has been put to evil purposes, social reform does not drive out selfishness, marvellous inventions are used to debauch the mind and kill the bodies of men. Science is not enough. Dr. Jacks has suggested that we might well take as a motto for human life the words written by Cromwell the day before the battle of Dunbar when he was hemmed in by superior forces and in a precarious position: 'We are upon an engagement very difficult.'

'As plants grow fastest by night, so men make their most rapid growth in knowledge and faith when times are dark and troubled.'

God made darkness and night. He made also the day, and the darkness lasts only its appointed time. Joy cometh in the morning.[1]

[1] F. H. Ballard, *Does War Shake Faith?*, 78.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Success through Failure.

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL H. WHEELER ROBINSON, M.A., D.D., REGENT'S PARK COLLEGE, OXFORD.

'Useful for ministering.'—2 Ti 4^{11} (R.V.).

In the national emergency all right-minded people want to be of as much use as they can. For those with special gifts, such as the physical strength of the young, the technical acquirements or practical experience of the middle-aged, there are obvious openings. But for a good many of us there must be the consciousness of comparative uselessness at such a time as this.

Even apart from such a time, there are few men and women who are not haunted by a sense of relative failure in making of life what it might have been. To all such our text has something to say, for the world largely depends on very ordinary people.

The text affords one of those phrases which may easily fail to arrest our attention, especially when the hyperboles and exaggerations of journalism (and perhaps also of the pulpit) have corrupted our linguistic taste. But it says exactly what it means, and it means a great deal. Behind it we are fortunately able to trace the record of a man of no conspicuous and distinguishing ability, a man indeed who failed to meet the first great challenge of his life and yet somehow made good, and made good by being just what he was and doing the particular work for which his limited capacities equipped him. This is the epitaph of John Mark, who became 'useful for ministering.' The translation 'ministry' is misleading. John Mark's contribution to life was to be a loyal servant of the ministers of God, and to enable more gifted men to do their work.

We catch a glimpse of his home as the house to which Peter naturally turned after his escape from prison, and it is a home where prayer was wont to be made. We see him again on the threshold of active service when he is taken by his cousin Barnabas and the new convert, Saul of Tarsus, to minister to them in their work as a sort of courier. Soon comes the test. The evangelistic ambition of Saul urges him to strike inland into Asia Minor with all its perils. For some reason Mark is unwilling to accompany him and Barnabas. This was something very blameworthy in the eyes of Saul, called Paul; as we learn from a later reference, Paul thought not good to take with them him who withdrew from them from Pamphylia and went not with them to the work.' This judgment was passed on the threshold of a further missionary journey and it led to the separation of Paul and Barnabas, the cousin of Mark. It was Barnabas who gave Mark his 'second chance' by taking him to Cyprus.

We can be quite sure that Paul would be severe on any man who put his hand to the plough and then looked back. But the next glimpse of Mark also comes through Paul's eyes and shows a complete reversal of this judgment. Paul, long after, as a prisoner writes of Mark as one of the 'men that have been a comfort unto me,' and commends him to the church at Colossae, evidently as one whom they might be reluctant to receive. In our text the Apostle describes Mark in the words that mean so much, 'useful for ministering.' Yet even this is not the end of the record. One of the earliest and most reliable traditions about the authorship of the Gospels implies that we owe the Second Gospel (destined to be fundamental to the others) to the work of John Mark as an interpreter of Peter, who in 1 P 5^{13} calls him 'my son.' So the man who failed erects a monument far more impressive than the Pyramids of Egypt, or Napoleon's tomb in Paris.

The lessons of this record are obvious enough, and the record itself makes the best exposition of the text. But a few things can be said by way of underlining certain features of it.

(1) What is to be the Christian attitude to those who fail? At any rate, not to call moral failure by any other than its proper name. Truth alone in moral judgment ministers to Christ. When, for example, we stand in Grasmere churchyard, looking at the graves of Hartley Coleridge and Wordsworth, we must not ignore the moral difference between them. Life has its solemn issues which we must not ignore. On the other hand, we do well always to carry the humbling consciousness that for each of us, as Conrad reminds us in his *Lord Jim*, there is a point where we should let go. The margin between success and failure is often a very narrow one. It is impressive to notice the consciousness of this in the life of Dale of Birmingham. This eminently successful man seemed to remain always aware of the narrow margins by which success had been his. If we carry this humility into our attitude to the failures of other men, we shall be able to render to them the service they need from us, whether it be that of clear condemnation, as from Paul, or of compassion and restoration, as from Barnabas. We ought not to make the mistake of blaming Paul and praising Barnabas. Both contributed to the future

development of John Mark. If we have failed morally we may need the sharp admonition as much as the encouragement to try again. The providential control of life is much more complex than we are apt to think, and all that each of us can expect to do is to make the contribution which God intends, trusting God to weave together the individual contributions of men into His final pattern. We must be honest in carrying out our convictions whether of praise or blame.

(2) What of the Christian confidence in the redemption of failure? For every one knows that the gospel means the redemption of life, and that within the realm of the gospel there can be no absolute failure if there is repentance and new endeavour. The Christian believes that a man's discovery of his true vocation may itself come through failure. Only by the elimination of unwarranted ambitions may a man discover what God means him to be and to do. Mark was never the man to be a missionary pioneer, and in one way it was his misfortune to be dragged at the heels of a relentless evangelist such as Paul. Yet in another way it was not a misfortune, for it helped him to discover that he could be 'useful for ministering' as a minister to the ministers of Christ. The gospel warrants the faith that any stumbling-block can be thus transformed into a stepping-stone, always provided that it is built into the *altar of service*.

(3) At the centre of our gospel there is a Cross, and that Cross is the supreme reminder of the real success which can disguise itself in apparent failure. George MacDonald remarks that some men's failures are eternities beyond other men's successes. Our Lord explains His own apparent failure by the words 'I came not to be ministered unto, but to minister.' There are many humble lives which have learnt this secret of joy in sorrow. I remember a widow, whose only child was an invalid, whilst she herself had no resources but those which her fingers could earn her as a sempstress. I had known her as a girl and remembered the bright promise of her life then. It looked as if she had failed and yet, when she told me that what had helped her to live was her ministry to her helpless boy, I knew from the look on her face when she said it that she had entered into the secret of Christ. She had found the joy of being 'useful for ministering.' Perhaps there is no more impressive way of bringing home to us the reality of success through failure than that which G. K. Chesterton adopts in his well-known poem 'The Donkey,' whose reply to the scorn of men is:

Fools! For I also had my hour,
One far fierce hour and sweet:
There was a shout about my ears,
And palms before my feet.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Worship in a Day of War.

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, B.D., B.Sc., KILLERMONT.

'Zebulun and Naphtali were a people that jeoparded their lives unto the death.'—Jg 5^{18}.

In gathering for worship the chief desire may be to turn from the clamour of the world's events and business to eternal verities. That great preacher, Dr. McLaren of Manchester, once said, 'So many preach about the times. Let one old man speak of eternity.'

But there are times when things that happen are so tremendous that they cannot be set aside even in worship. They have to be brought, as King Hezekiah brought the threatening letter of his enemy, and laid before God and looked at in the light of His word. When people have great cause for common thankfulness in their hearts and an uprising of hope, when admiration for the courage of heroes mingles with mourning for the gallant dead, religion would be a poor thing if it had no bearing on the emotions and purposes of the hour.

It is sometimes a perplexing fact that the New Testament, and especially the teaching of Christ, does not yield more direct guidance for this time of war. The simple explanation is that in the New Testament Christian folk are a weak minority with no public responsibilities. They might be let alone: more likely they would be persecuted. Their call was to private virtue or to public martyrdom. The modern situation where Christians have much power, have votes, may hold office in the State, is in these respects more like that often contemplated in the Old Testament where the people of God are called to dominate circumstances by united action. When men are called to use their strength for the defence of the weak and to stand for the preservation of an inheritance of liberty and truth that is more precious than life it is inevitable that they should turn to Old Testament history and to such a text as this about the courage of Zebulun and Naphtali 'who jeoparded their lives unto the death.'

1. There is large ground for grave satisfaction and gratitude to-day in the fact that events have contributed to clear up any lingering doubts of conscience about entering upon this war. Others

than extreme pacifists have doubted if war can ever achieve any good, and critics of policy have made much of the argument that subtle considerations of selfish interest swayed the nation's counsels. But it has grown ever more clear that this war is to be estimated, not by any schemes or policies, but simply as the halt called to lawless murderous violence. Lord Halifax, speaking at a Prayer Meeting for Peace two years ago, said that the pursuit of peace under all conceivable conditions might mean the acceptance of greater evils even than war, and that therefore Christian thought throughout the centuries has held that in resistance to greater evils it was justifiable for Christian men to take up arms. By one act after another the enemy has made it plainer and plainer that the religious and moral elements of the inherited civilization are threatened with subversion. That this is increasingly evident confirms the unity of the nation and kindles its spiritual fires.

2. In the situation which has arisen, one thing is often said rather rashly and thoughtlessly which requires cautious examination. 'This is Nemesis, judgment on us,' said a woman over the phone the day Norway was invaded. It is so easy to say tragedies are judgments and so often, as Jesus pointed out, so wrong. It is foolish to call events judgments unless a clear connexion is seen. 'Whatsoever a man soweth that also shall he reap' is often terribly true, but before applying the text, it must be ascertained first that the man in question did sow the evil and second that he and not some one else does the reaping. It may well be maintained that a nation that followed a policy of appeasement was not sowing war, and it is obvious that it is the invaded nations that are at present reaping; or, in this nation, mainly its youth who have not had time to sow anything much. Such reflections make for hesitation in entering the line of thought that interprets the war as a judgment. Yet it is a large truth that the pain and sorrow of the world are bound up with human sin, and that every evil constitutes in some fashion a call to repentance. But to reach the conscience it needs to be worked out with some precision. What are the particular sins of common Christian people, of which, confronted by this war, they should specially repent.

One sin may be the slight and vague interest they took in public policy and the fact that even this was usually a selfish sort of interest. The criticism of democracy is made every day, that few vote; that the popular press reveals a very low standard of intelligent concern for large affairs; that the finest men are not sought as leaders. It may be a question for each individual conscience how far in his own case this criticism hits the mark.

In particular, this lack of interest springs largely from a narrow contentment with one's own economic position. People who have had jobs and earned a more or less comfortable living have refused to be conscious of the indubitable fact that millions upon millions of human beings sweat and starve all their lives. The progress of science and industry and commerce has been regarded as a road to the increase of the prosperity of those already enjoying comfort rather than as the opening up of possibilities of decent conditions to those whose existence has hitherto been wretchedness. This lack of vision, sympathy, imagination has in some ways vitiated the policy of every nation.

But, above all, as those who have been entrusted with the gospel, a gospel that has proved itself an explosive and uplifting force in the life of men and nations, Christians must confess that they have failed and still fail in enthusiastic missionary zeal and in their witness to their faith and hope. If it be true that real Christianity would deliver the world from war as from other evils, what Christian is free from some share of blame in the Church's failure to make Christ manifest in His power to save?

In so far as the calamity of war is to be interpreted as a call to penitence, it is along these lines that repentance should move. If in such ways men had lived more earnestly, thoughtfully, prayerfully, the history of the world would have taken a different course; the vow for Christians to make is that if the chance is given them they will in years to come live with more earnest concern for the common good and show sincerer diligence in proclaiming the gospel of salvation.

3. Such reflections, however, deal with what might have been. Now that war has come, and in this fashion, the clear and certain thing to say about it is that it constitutes a call to do and to endure. This is without question one of the great hours of history. An attempt to grasp the destiny of mankind and control, not only the outward circumstances, but the inmost thoughts and aspirations of men's souls is being made by a man, a group of men, a blindly following nation who have chosen methods of fraud and pitiless cruelty. Many may indeed wish that they had lived in other times, but is that the noblest wish? May it not be a privilege to live in great and dangerous days? Is it not possible to noble souls to say with Rupert Brooke—

> Now, God be thanked who has matched us with
> His hour.

This is the reflection that one would offer, if they will take it, to the youth who go forth to fight. The Bible has its heroes like Saul who hid among the corn sheaves, David who shepherded his sheep, Jeremiah the timid, shrinking man who did not wish to be a prophet, who because they stood forth when the call came grew great in soul and did valiantly. Men have been facing this crisis quietly, grimly, steadfastly as one that involves an unhappy yet unavoidable duty. But is there not much, and especially in these last weeks, to fire men with the conviction that grim though the task may be, a high call sounds and that in obeying it they will be upheld by the grace of God.

Seventh Sunday after Trinity.

The Merciful.

'Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.'—Mt 5[7].

The Beatitudes are the portrait of the man whose life illustrates the rule of God. In the end, as we ponder the inner meaning of these sayings we realize we are gazing upon the face of Christ. Every quality that is mentioned here shines in His own life. None can listen to that voice or gaze on that face without hearing and seeing this work of grace that we know as mercy. Like a scarlet thread it runs throughout the entire length of the Bible. As we read the sacred page, we are conscious that we deal with a 'God, who delighteth in mercy.' It is one of the favourite words of Jesus. He inherited it from the Old Testament, but gave it a still richer content. Often it has been pointed out that the New Testament is only to be fully understood in the light of the Old; that the Old Testament is to be interpreted likewise in the light of the New Testament. In the Holy of Holies in the Tabernacle and in the Temple there is the 'mercy-seat.' Prophet, priest, and psalmist extolled the mercy of God. Mercy is of the essence of the gospel, for the message of Jesus is concerned with the redemptive mercy of God.

Now there is an obvious and a less obvious meaning in this word 'mercy.' We see it, in its more obvious setting, in great humanitarian works such as hospitals and infirmaries, hostels and homes, where the sick and the infirm, the aged and the desolate are ministered to, and cared for. Thank God for all of these. We see it in the work of the 'Red Cross' on the battlefield. It is manifest in great social movements and in the social services which are part of the policy of all enlightened governments. The Spirit of Christ in the midst of the world is still the world's mightiest motive force in establishing and maintaining all works of mercy, and these bring their own blessedness both to recipient and to worker. But He meant much more than this when He uttered this Beatitude.

Mercy is a rich word. It is difficult to define. It touches upon our attitude and personal relationship to our fellow-men—indeed, to all living creatures. It implies the power to get alongside our fellow-men, to put ourselves in their place and to see their point of view. To be merciful in our attitude and relationship with men is to feel with them, and for them. That man is merciful who has cultivated the grace of sympathetic appreciation of his fellows, and this is always the mark of a magnanimous spirit. Such men and women are sure to receive mercy for, as some one has said, 'The hearts of God and man alike are open to him whose heart is open to them.' Such shall obtain mercy. Let us explore some of the avenues of thought thus opened up.

In the first place, *to be merciful is to be kindly in spirit and in our judgment of others*. We can do it if we constantly remind ourselves that our fellows do not care, any more than ourselves, to wear their hearts upon their sleeves. Little imagination is needed to realize the tears that lurk behind the smile, the corroding anxiety hidden in the heart, the unseen cross that lies deep in the heart, the unknown, untalked-of, aching emptiness in many a human spirit. They are always there, and mercy has a wide field for the exercise of kindliness and consideration. Will we remember it before we form an estimate even of our worst enemies? Only a very few are embittered and abandoned. They are among the lost.

Be merciful. Cultivate a kindly spirit. But the work of mercy does not stop there. *It seeks to save, and to restore it.* It

> Stretches out a loving hand
> To wrestlers with the troubled sea.

That is part of the veritable mercy of God. In the twenty-third Psalm there are the words, 'He restoreth my soul.' This was the redeeming work of Jesus Christ, who came into the world to seek and to save that which is lost. Those who have strayed are much less in need of our condemnation than our help. Mercy will give it without stint. None can miss that note who reads the Gospels. Consider that lovely series of pictures painted by Luke—the artist-physician. A shepherd having ninety-nine sheep safe in the sheepfold is restless until he has sought and found the one sheep that has strayed.

A woman who has lost one coin cannot be at peace until she has found it.

How wide is the field opened out by this thought! When one comes to think of it, Christ's work of mercy is the almost exact equivalent of His conception of justice. We hold the two apart. Christ brings them together. Justice, in our view, is to give the wrong-doer his deserts. How often the method fails to reclaim the sinner, the wrong-doer. It is true that in a sense he gets his deserts. None can escape the consequences of sin. The great moral law of life inevitably recoils upon those who offend against it. Its repercussions are left in the soul of the sinner. That is the working of the justice of God. Man, too, must of necessity have regard to the well-being of the greatest number. He must devise means to restrain the wrong-doer. Society must be secured against crime and the criminal. But retributive justice is not enough. Left at that it fails of its true object, the reformation of the wrong-doer, and his restoration to his place in society.

Jesus never failed to condemn sin though He castigated most severely sins of the spirit, and was incredibly lenient, according to modern ways of regarding it, with the sins of the flesh. But He never lost sight of the sinner. He, too, is a potential son of God. Zaccheus, the renegade Jew, hated and despised by his own countrymen, was, in the eyes of Christ, entitled to his place in Abraham's family.

The whole world needs to be baptized into Christ's spirit of mercy and love. We ought to mean no less than this when we pray, 'Our Father, who art in heaven.' Who is 'Our'? Who is included and who are excluded? If we are to realize, in any true sense, the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, we must practise mercy.

How great is this theme! How exhaustless its possibilities! How wide its application! If we dare to rise to the vision, what then. In calm, quiet assurance, Jesus tells us. We shall obtain mercy. It is a two-way traffic. It is one of God's great laws of life. His universe works in that way and in no other. When shall we learn the lesson. As we live in the spirit of creative, restoring love we shall know more and more of the blessedness of fellowship with God. As we live in fellowship with our fellow-men we shall learn more and more of the blessedness of God's divine rule, His Everlasting Kingdom. We are living in a world that is full of fear and hatred. The one way to cast these out is to live in faith and hope and love.

'Behold I show unto you a more excellent way.'[1]

[1] J. Short, *All Things Are Yours*, 65.

Nicolas Berdyaev: A Philosopher of Spiritual Freedom.

By the Reverend Geraint V. Jones, M.A., B.Litt., Halifax.

At a time when the foundations of European liberty are in jeopardy it is refreshing to be reminded that there is a profound thinker who is in revolt against the presuppositions on which contemporary society is built, advocating with passionate eloquence the supreme need for the maintenance of spiritual liberty at all costs.

Nicolas Alexandrovitch Berdyaev, born in 1878 in Kiev, South Russia, was at one time a professor of philosophy at Moscow University, but after being twice imprisoned on account of his rejection of the official philosophy of the U.S.S.R. was expelled by the Bolsheviks in 1922 and fled to Paris. Being a strong critic of the Erastianism of the Orthodox Church, he found himself driven into a theological position which is neither Catholic nor Orthodox nor Protestant, but which might best be described as post-Protestant, including a strong dash of the prophetic. As an interpreter of history with an apocalyptic turn of mind, an antagonist of contemporary humanism, a passionate believer in the realization of creative freedom as the true destiny of man, with a Dostoievskian preoccupation with the deep levels of evil in human life, it is not easy to classify him with any contemporary philosopher or theologian: he has nothing in common with the Barthian group, while at the same time standing equally remote from theological Liberalism. A close study of four or five of his great books (*The Meaning of History, Freedom and the Spirit, The Destiny of Man, Spirit and Reality*, and one might add his brief study of Dostoievski) reveals a massive

intellect and an imaginative grasp of the implications of European thought unrivalled in his contemporaries. The only comparable mind of recent years was that of the late Miguel de Unamuno, who was in his way another rebel against the recent currents of European thought and had a similarly vivid imaginative grasp of spiritual issues. Standing aside from, or perhaps it would be better to say above, the organized churches, he opposes his notion of freedom to the collective, the 'quantitative' majority, and makes a plea for the 'qualitative' minority, both within and outside the Church. He has passed, in his own words, 'beyond the limits of philosophical, theological, and mystical knowledge so dear to the western mind, as well in Protestant and Catholic circles as in the sphere of academic philosophy.' One might describe Berdyaev's position as a sort of fourth dimensional theology. In this short article an account of the significance of his religious thought for this generation will be confined to three aspects: spiritual freedom, the ethics of creativeness, and his conception of history.

(1) Spiritual freedom in its widest sense is the primary condition of the growth of personality and of society as an organic unity. Spirit is for Berdyaev (as for St. Paul) a fundamental category of being. It is in terms of freedom that the answers to most of the problems of human destiny are to be found. 'God does not force us to recognize Him, for His purpose lies in freedom of the spirit, and He is only revealed in the freedom of its life.... The action of divine grace presupposes the action of human freedom,' for all faith is a 'free spiritual act,' faith without freedom being an impossibility. Without spiritual freedom there can be no guarantee that any sort of society will be more humane than any other; for it is the spiritual not the economic or political fact which must claim primacy and which determines the direction of life. 'The socialist state,' Berdyaev writes in *Spirit and Reality*, 'will not differ to any great extent from the bourgeois state unless it is animated by spirit. Spirit, manifest in freedom, love, and purpose, can alone resist the bourgeois kingdom of money, the kingdom of worldly power.' 'God expects freedom from man; He wants his free response to the divine call. True liberty is that which God demands from us and not that which we demand from God. It is upon this foundation that man's freedom is based.'

Berdyaev deals with the implications of freedom most thoroughly in *Freedom and the Spirit*; but throughout his work he returns to this subject. In his study of Dostoievski, for example, which summarizes so much of his own thought, he finds, in the tale of the Grand Inquisitor (from *The Brothers Karamazov*) a statement of the issues involved in spiritual freedom as opposed to compulsion, orthodoxy, socialism, and the collective. But not only in this fable does Dostoievski posit this problem of freedom versus compulsion: for Berdyaev his great fellow-Russian is above all else a prophetic declarer of the right of man to rebel and exercise his freedom, concerned as he is with human destiny in terms of strife and good and evil. For Dostoievski (and Berdyaev) 'the justification of both God and men must be looked for in freedom, of which the tragic process of the world is only a function. . . . So he studied the destiny of man exclusively in freedom and the destiny of freedom in man. . . . Christianity is the religion of freedom and in its essence and content recognizes it in all its forms.' The Grand Inquisitor, on the contrary, stands for all that negates freedom, and 'really reaches the socialist religion of material bread and the social ant-heap,' representing all that is embodied in modern Fascism and collectivism what Ortega y Gasset calls the 'statification' of life. When he says that 'men will be free when they renounce freedom' the Inquisitor is acting as the mouth-piece of the modern collectivist mood which Berdyaev, in the interests of Christian liberty, repudiates. 'At the basis of my notion of the world as I see it,' he writes, 'there has always lain the idea of liberty, and in his fundamental intuition of liberty I found Dostoievski as it were on his own special ground.' Both Dostoievski and Berdyaev had adequate experience of oppression: the former of Tsarist rule and the latter of the Communism which replaced it: hence their revolt against tyranny in any form.

If Berdyaev rebels against a present phase of social philosophy, he is equally rebellious against modern humanism. Although, he points out, it is to humanism that science owes its freedom to develop, science has at the same time reached the summit of what Berdyaev calls its negative development, and now humanism is 'degenerating into its opposite and is tantamount to a denial of man and the destruction of all that can be considered humanitarianism.' As he shows in *The Meaning of History*, humanism is becoming inhumanism, in so far as the human image is being defaced by collectivism in politics and technics in the social-economic sphere. He returns to this standpoint time and time again, and his alternative to the humanist disintegration of man is submission to a higher power. For 'man ceases to know himself

when he knows no higher being or other principles than those contained in the confined circle of his nature.' Marx and Nietzsche are the highest exemplification of the result of this humanistic process.

(2) Arising from Berdyaev's ascription of primacy to freedom is his conception of ethics as finding their fulfilment in creativeness. The highest ethics are those of creativeness, for God created 'freely and out of freedom.' In creativeness, that is, the expression of some form of the artistic consciousness, is found the union of grace and freedom, and that is the activity of the Holy Spirit. Creativeness implies something where there was nothing: it is therefore a process involving an act of freedom, for the thing created would not have been 'there' were it not for the freedom of decision which summons it into being. The ethical life combining grace and freedom in a creative act is higher than that resulting from the legalistic ethics of Kant or the legislative ethics of Tolstoy's morality. The Sermon on the Mount, even, is 'legislative,' and therefore does not represent spiritual freedom as much as a spontaneous creative act. God does not compel, whereas legislative ethics involve compulsion. Creativeness involves two elements: grace deriving from on high, and genius possessed by man, uniting in the freedom which results in the newness of any creative act. 'Every creative change in the world is the result of the intervention of spirit in being, that is of freedom and grace,' he writes in *Spirit and Reality*. Here again the two fundamental principles of Berdyaev's thought are seen to emerge: the primacy of spirit and the necessity of freedom.

(3) Thirdly: Berdyaev's antagonism to contemporary thought is further exemplified in his philosophy of history. The problem of history is the problem of the meaning of the historical process. For Berdyaev there is no solution to this problem within time, that is within the process itself. 'No conception of history is feasible without the idea of fulfilment because history is essentially eschatological. . . . History and its conception are possible only when the world process is conceived as a catastrophic one.' In a sense his philosophy of history is pessimistic, as any Christian eschatology is bound to be, involving the conviction that man by his own efforts is incapable of achieving the salvation of the race within time. 'Man's self-affirmation leads to his perdition; the free play of human forces unconnected with any higher aim brings about the exhaustion of man's creative powers.' The present phase of the historical process is the result of such self-affirmation: it embodies the disintegration of the human image which has been in progress since the Renaissance, which was the beginning of the process of differentiation and secularization of culture. Although history is regarded by Berdyaev as the interaction of the divine and human, the irruption of time into eternity, it is bound, when consciously divorced from the supernatural, to lead to failure; for history is impossible without human freedom, and human freedom apart from grace can only lead, through the humanization of life (as in Communism and Fascism), to catastrophe. Therefore there can be no real progress. Each generation has its own goal, values, and meaning, whereby it approximates to the divine life. The problem of history for Berdyaev is not one of analysis, as it would appear to be in Dr. Toynbee's great *Study of History*, but one of interpretation and of the ultimate destiny of man. He is concerned not with history as 'the totality of remembered events' (Tillich), but as a dynamic process, dynamized by the interaction of the eternal and the temporal and which has to be rescued by the eternal in the form of catastrophic intervention. Berdyaev's emphasis on the divine dynamic and its acceptance or rejection by man is a healthy counterblast to the humanistic-progressive-evolutionary view which does not attach sufficient importance to radical evil.

Berdyaev's thought can be summed up in the following passage from *The Destiny of Man*:

> We must struggle for spiritual freedom and spiritual liberation in the realm of thought, in the state, in the family, in social life. This is a moral imperative. But freedom must not become a fanatical idea by which man is possessed, for then it degenerates into tyranny. Strive for freedom, but never forget about truth, love, justice, or freedom will become empty, false, meaningless. Strive for the fullness of life. Strive for truth, love, and justice, but do not forget about freedom. . . . Strive for real spiritual unity and brotherhood. But if it cannot be attained, let multiplicity have free play and give a chance to a free search for the still undiscovered single truth. Strive for the liberation of human emotions, but do not allow yourself to be overpowered by feelings or let them become detached from the fullness of life which includes thought and life and intellect, will and the moral life, relation to God and to the religious life. Only the spirit synthesizes the life of the soul: without it the soul disintegrates into elements of thought, sensations, volitions, emotions. Strive for spirituality, that is for the wholeness of life and for creativeness in every sphere of existence.

Contributions and Comments.

The Walking on the Sea (St. John vi. 16–21).

θεωροῦσιν τὸν Ἰησοῦν περιπατοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ ἐγγὺς τοῦ πλοίου γινόμενον· καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν.

The incident usually spoken of as 'The Walking on the Sea,' or 'The Storm on the Lake' is recorded in the first two Gospels and also in John. In each of the three the Apostles are represented as seeing Jesus *περιπατοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης*. Their agitation and its cause are also emphasized by Matthew and Mark, whilst John is content with the one word *ἐφοβήθησαν* to describe their affrighted state as our Lord approached the boat. In each of the three accounts we have our Lord's reassuring words *ἐγώ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε*. Mark has it that the boat was *ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης* where John is more definite with *ἐληλακότες οὖν ὡς σταδίους εἴκοσι πέντε ἢ τριάκοντα* when the Apostles recognized our Lord.

It is to Matthew that we owe the attempt of Peter to go to our Lord after He had made Himself known to the affrighted apostles, and how they both went up into the boat. Mark has *ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον* whilst John reads *ἤθελον οὖν λαβεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον*. The result of our Lord's going up into the boat is given by Matthew and Mark as a cessation of the storm *ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος*. John's mention of the five and twenty or thirty furlongs already traversed leaves the impression that the boat was still at some distance from the western shore, and the conclusion in v.[21], *καὶ εὐθέως τὸ πλοῖον ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἰς ἣν ὑπῆγον* suggests that when our Lord was taken aboard the space still to be traversed was covered at transcendent speed.

How are we to understand this incident? Is it to be numbered amongst the wonderful *ἔργα* of Jesus as described by John? Have we here a *σημεῖον*, though John does not expressly so term it?

Dr. Westcott unhesitatingly calls the incident 'The Sign upon the Lake' and says that as a miracle it stands alone. Like the Transfiguration it anticipates some of the consequences of the Resurrection. It is, moreover, a revelation of the sovereignty of humanity in Christ over the material conditions of the present existence. 'We must not think,' he adds, 'of law suspended, but of a new force called into exercise' (*The Gospel According to St. John:* The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes, i. 217.)

Close on forty years before Westcott published his edition of John Sanday had made his earliest attempt towards a critical survey of the Fourth Gospel, and his conclusions on this incident are specially interesting in view of his later incursions in the same field. This is what he says, 'I hardly see the necessity, with Lücke and Meyer, to press *ἤθελον λαβεῖν* into opposition to the Synoptists, as though Jesus were not actually received into the ship. The stress is really on the willingness of the disciples. "Before they shrank back through fear, but now they were glad to receive Him." The sudden bringing of the ship to land we are tempted to explain psychologically. The Apostle, intent upon the marvellous occurrence and occupied with his own devout conclusions, would not notice the motion of the ship; and, a favourable breeze arising, it might easily be at the land before he was aware. At least this may serve as a conjecture.' [*The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel*, 125.]

There are several other works on the Gospel in which this incident is given a prominent place; but there are two in particular that demand more than a passing notice.

That veteran Unitarian scholar, Dr. J. Estlin Carpenter, whose presentation of the Johannine problem was founded on very different presuppositions from those of Westcott and Sanday, gives in a few terse sentences his conclusions on this incident, 'At his voice their fears subside. They were minded (1[43]) to receive him into the boat. It was not necessary. No sooner was the purpose formed than they found themselves with him at the land. The transcendence of Jesus over all physical conditions could not be more forcibly displayed' [*The Johannine Writings*, 423].

It fell to Archbishop Bernard to review Dr. Carpenter's book in the *Review of the Churches* for April 1927, and in his remarks on Dr. Carpenter's explanation, as quoted above, he anticipated the view which he himself puts forward in his edition of St. John in *The International Critical Commentary* series. [Dr. Bernard had worked for over a quarter of a century on the Johannine problem,

but did not live to see his MS. of the commentary through the press. He died as Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, in August 1927.] In those two splendid volumes published in 1928, the ripest Anglican learning is brought to the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, and if one who was privileged to enjoy his help and guidance through all the years that began in the Lecture Hall of Trinity College amongst his earliest pupils and ended only with the Master's death—if such an one may venture to dissent from the explanation Dr. Bernard gives of this incident of the Storm on the Lake, he may also claim that in doing so he is but following what the Master would ever commend to his pupils—a desire to find the truth for themselves, however difficult may be the road along which to seek it.

Verbal similarities such, *e.g.*, as the pronouncement ἐγώ εἰμι μὴφοβεῖσθε show, according to Dr. Bernard, that John almost certainly uses Mark, and these verbal similarities are 'the more remarkable by reason of the tendency in John's narrative to *correct* Mark's report at other points.' 'John retells the Marcan story of the Storm on the Lake in such a way that he removes any suggestion of the miraculous Walking on the Sea—while he retains some of Mark's words' [Introduction, p. xcvii. f.].

To follow as Dr. Bernard leads us in his notes—the boat was keeping close to the shore and the disciples were on the look-out for our Lord before the storm broke. The expression ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης 'need not mean more than that the water was all around them,' whilst ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης does not necessarily mean more than 'by the seashore,' the idea that walking upon the sea is a Divine prerogative may possibly account for the transformation of the Johannine tradition, which is void of miracle, into the supernatural story in Mark and Matthew.' Dr. Bernard cites Jn 21^1 as a parallel and there ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς τιβεριάδος must mean at the sea of Tiberias. Probably John meant to convey in the first instance that when the boat got into the shallow water the disciples 'saw Jesus in the uncertain light walking by the lake and were frightened, not being sure of what they saw.' But if Jesus was only walking on the shore why did not John describe Him as ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς? and moreover, the passage cited above as a parallel wants the word περιπατοῦντα, the absence of which would appear to nullify the parallel.

The description of Jesus as approaching the boat ἐγγὺς τοῦ πλοίου γινόμενον implies a movement across the water, and when John uses the aorist ἐγένετο of the same verb, would he not seem to point to a process and not merely a result? If our Lord were only walking on the shore there would be no need of His going into the boat, and Mark's statement, ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, possibly derived from Peter, falls. Dr. Bernard would say that the disciples 'were wishing to receive Him into the boat,' ἤθελον being used here as in 7^{44}, 16^{19}, the wish not being translated into action. But, does this secondary idea of a wish not being satisfied, of an intention not being carried through, necessarily lie in the word?

It does not seem necessary to translate with Dr. Moffatt 'so they agreed to take him on board.' The Revisers read 'they were willing, therefore, to receive him into the boat,' where the 'therefore' refers us back to our Lord's words of reassurance, and may not Dr. Sanday's note hold the truth when he points to the willingness of the disciples to take our Lord on board as in contrast to their erstwhile hesitancy and shrinking through fear?

To bring all this to a conclusion. Is there any need to infer from John's silence that additional details given by Matthew and Mark are added in order to heighten the sense of the miraculous, and have no historical value? Is John's intention when describing the storm on the lake to correct Mark's report and to eliminate the miraculous from the incident?

To discuss how such questions are suggested by, or arise out of, the mediate Johannine authorship, as held in one form or another, would be to enter on a very wide field; but this must be said here. Any theory of authorship yet propounded which is opposed to the traditional view seems to raise more difficulties than it solves, and to suggest more questions than it gives an answer to. The direct apostolic authorship has its own difficulties, but in spite of them there are signs of a return on the part of critical opinion to the traditional view that the Fourth Gospel is the direct work of John the son of Zebedee.

It is not in any sense other than that of gratitude to the memory of a great teacher, and in fulfilment of what he would ever have his pupils practise, that one of them would here express himself as unconvinced by Dr. Bernard's explanation of this incident of the storm on the lake. There is no need to defend that memory against any possible charge of rationalizing exegesis.

CHARLES A. WEBSTER.

Bandon, County Cork.

Matthew xi. 25–27—Luke x. 21–22.

Both Norden and Dr. N. P. Williams, though for different reasons, regard the fuller form of these verses as given in Matthew as being the original in 'Q,' and Luke as having abbreviated the account.

It remains to consider their meaning.

They follow after the Baptist's question from prison, 'Art thou the coming one?' that is, the Messiah; which Jesus answers by an indirect claim to Messiahship in the form of a quotation from Is 61^{1} combined with 35^{5-6} and possibly 29^{18-19}. The same quotation begins the sermon at Nazareth, and is there combined with 59^{6}. This passage is undoubtedly Messianic, and was so understood by the Nazarenes; and, as the Baptist drew largely on Isaiah, would have given him the answer for which he asked. Next, in Mt 11^{10} cf. Lk 7^{27}, we have the quotation from Mal 3^{1}, which Jesus applied to Himself, asserting that the Baptist is the Elijah of Malachi's prophecy, and that He Himself is therefore the Messiah. Next the comparison of the Baptist with the 'son of man,' which here must be equivalent to the Messiah. And then this passage: 'I confess to thee . . . that thou hast hidden *these things*. . . .' 'These things' are shown by the context to mean the revelation of the Messiahship of Jesus. The 'wise and prudent' include the scribes and Pharisees, and the 'babes' the Apostles. 'All things have been given me by my Father' means, as Burkitt[1] says, all these experiences of acceptance and rejection; the expression is not parallel to the post-resurrection utterance in Mt 28^{18}, 'All authority hath been given unto me,' but rather to 'The cup which my Father hath given me,' Jn 18^{11}.

The 'son' in the phrase, 'No man knoweth the Son,' looks back to 'the Son of man' in *v.*[19], and, to express the sense, which is here left to be understood, we must add, '. . . . and to whomsoever the Father willeth to reveal him,' as in the corresponding clause, and as implied in *v.*[25]; that is, the expression is parallel to Jn 6^{44}—'No man can come to me, except the Father . . . draw him,' and means, 'No one recognizes my sonship as being that of the Messiah, and no one recognizes that God is messianically my Father.'

None of the Synoptists ever implies that Jesus either claimed or was understood to claim during His earthly life to be more than the Messiah. The sonship is the Messianic sonship of Ps $89^{26.\ 27}$ 'He shall cry unto me, Thou art my father, my God, and the rock of my salvation. I also will make him my firstborn, the highest of the kings of the earth'; and of Ps 2^{7} 'Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee' (cf. 'This is my beloved son,' Mk 1^{11} 9^{7}, Mt 3^{17} 12^{18} 17^{5}, Lk 3^{22} 9^{35}). In the concluding clause 'Take my yoke upon you,' the yoke is not *that which I lay upon you*, but, *that which is laid upon me*, and when Jesus calls it 'well-made' He is not commending His own, but His Father's carpentry. In the opposite sense we have, 'My Father did lade you with a heavy yoke,' said by Rehoboam (1 K 12^{11}). It is an invitation to become the yoke-fellow of Jesus. The same metaphor is used in the account of the conversion of St. Paul—'It is hard for thee to kick against the ox-goad' (Acts 26^{14}), or 'Needs must, when God drives'; 'I beseech thee also, true yoke-fellow' (Ph 4^{3}); and similarly, 'Come unto me, ye burdened . . . my burden is light,' means, the burden laid upon me—share my load with me, and you will find it light. The best illustration is 'My peace and my joy,' Jn 14^{27} 15^{11}. Faith and love make burdens light, learn then of me.

F. J. Badcock.

St. Augustine's College, Canterbury.

[1] *J.T.S.*, xii. p. 296.

St. Matthew xi. 25–30—St. Luke x. 21–22.

Please permit me some comments upon the article by Dr. N. P. Williams in your January and February numbers. Several of his arguments seem to me to be unsatisfactory.

Dr. Williams claims that *vv.*[28-30] in Matthew belong to the whole passage and that the whole comes from Q. He accounts for St. Luke's omission of *vv.*[28-30] by supposing that St. Luke thought these verses inappropriate in the context of the victory of Christ's followers over the demons, and that he thought he had sufficiently expressed the message of these verses elsewhere in his Gospel. But Dr. Williams himself stresses the point that St. Luke did not know the proper context of the whole saying, so we are asked to believe that the Evangelist chose a context which made him feel that he had to cut out these striking verses. This seems highly improbable, both in view of the content of these verses and of St. Luke's marked respect for his Q material.

On the other hand, it is the Matthæan editor's plan to group sayings regardless of their original context. What Dr. Williams says about the poetic structure of the three-member passage need only

prove that the editor's arrangement in this instance was unusually happy. *Vv.*[28-30] do not so obviously belong to *vv.*[25-27] that if we had found *vv.* [28-30] elsewhere in Luke we should still have thought that the Matthæan context was the original. I conclude that Mt 11[28-30] did not form a continuous passage with *vv.*[25-28] in Q.

More important is the meaning of the verses common to Matthew and Luke. Dr. Williams goes even further than Bishop Gore did in *Belief in Christ* (see p. 56) in asserting the metaphysical relationship between Christ and the Father implied (so he thinks) in these verses. He bids us note the ἐπι in ἐπιγινώσκει as part of the proof that the passage affirms that only the Son *fully* knows the Father and only the Father *fully* knows the Son. Dr. Williams appears to have overlooked the words 'and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.' These words show that the kind of knowledge of God or of the Son spoken of is not incapable of being reached by human beings, so if Christ claimed to possess it He was not thereby unveiling His Deity. In this connexion we may note that Matthew uses ἐπιγινώσκειν as the mere equivalent of γινώσκειν in 14[35], as does Mark in 6[33. 54], and Luke in 7[37] 23[7] 24[16. 31] and often in Acts. More important still, St. Paul uses ἐπιγινώσκειν of his knowing God some day in 1 Co 13[12] (Dr. Williams quotes the passage), while Ro 1[28], Eph 1[17] 4[13], Col 1[10] 2[2], 2 P 1[2. 3. 8] and 2[20] speak of an ἐπιγνώσις of God or of Christ in a way which formally excludes Dr. Williams' interpretation of Mt 11[27].

In view of all this there is no need to see in Mt 11[27] anything more than an assertion that at first no one except the Father knew that Jesus was His Messianic Son, and no one recognized the true character of the Father except Jesus. The first part of this assertion is obviously true, and the second part is traditional Christian orthodoxy. There seems to be no reason why Jesus in a moment of spiritual exaltation should not thus have praised the Father for this Messianic relationship. The mood of the passage is very akin to that which, according to Mt 16[17], followed St. Peter's first recognition of His Messiahship.

Dr. Williams' confident dogmatism on this point is in curious contrast with the cautious hesitation of his predecessor in the Lady Margaret Professorship at Oxford, who said of this passage, 'As an expression of Christian belief about Jesus, which eventually came to be attributed to Jesus Himself, it is wholly intelligible. As a saying uttered by Jesus it is perhaps less easy to explain. For myself, I am not ashamed to confess that I am not able to make up my mind' (A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, 263).

One further consideration. Dr. Williams tries to remove the prejudice against admitting the Dominical origin of our passage which arises from the theory that Jesus concealed His Messiahship until His immediate followers discovered it by a venture of faith. He regards this as a case of a preconceived theory being in conflict with a fact. This is not quite fair. The theory of the 'Messianic mystery' is *not* a preconceived theory. It is the plain implication of St. Mark's Gospel. Then on other grounds Matthæan, and still more Johannine, unsupported departures from Mark are suspected of being secondary, and theological rather than historical. Here, however, it is a case of Mark against Q, or rather would be if our passage involved a public proclamation of His Messiahship by Jesus before Cæsarea Philippi. But it is not a public proclamation, unless Mt 11[28-30] be an original part of it, as we have seen reason to doubt; and, as Dr. Williams himself urges, as we do not know the original context of the passage we cannot assert that Q did put it before Cæsarea Philippi. In other words, we can accept the Dominical character of the passage without giving up the theory of the 'Messianic mystery.'

A. E. Morris.

St. David's College, Lampeter.

Adolf Hitler.

In his interesting notice of Horst Stephan's *Die Geschichte der evangelischen Theologie seit dem Deutschen Idealismus* in your February issue Dr. Garvie writes: 'I have not noticed any reference to the Fuehrer, nor does his name appear in the Index.' Although it appears that Adolf Hitler is not mentioned by name in the book, yet surely he is the person intended in the first sentence of the paragraph from which Dr. Garvie quotes (p. 286). 'In this crisis one force alone developed power sufficient for victory, the union namely of the national with the socialist ideas, the way for which had been prepared in German Idealism and later by such men as Wichern, Stoecker, and Naumann, but which was realized in the new situation of Germany only when it became rooted in national and racial ideas, and with the impassioned appearance on the scene of a man conscious of his call to leadership (*das fortreissende Auftreten eines zur Fuehrung sich berufen wissenden Mannes*).'

Earlier on the same page Stephan remarks of

previous attempts at reconstruction: 'But they did not win victory. The leader who should carry all before him (*der fortreissende Fuehrer* again) and the all-powerful idea were denied them.'

This phrase '*der fortreissende Fuehrer*' then seems to be all that Stephan has to say about Adolf Hitler; which after all is not surprising in a book about theology! It is moreover a judgment of fact and not of value. The first time I read 'a man who knew himself called to leadership' I thought the words might still cover a possible doubt in other people's minds about the validity of the call. It would be a speculative undertaking, however, to try to determine Stephan's private opinion of the Fuehrer. Dr. Garvie has noted how impersonal are his estimates even of the theologians who are his proper subject. More pertinent would be his real attitude to 'the national revival under National Socialism,' in its religious aspects. The conclusion Dr. Garvie quotes is immediately preceded by this sentence: 'Here the feeling of decline is replaced by new joy in creating, the will to unite and organize is renewed, courage and opportunity are provided for the strenuous ordering of social and economic life, and therewith a firm ground for efforts after the ethical education of the nation.' A German should know best how far this is true, and I do not know that any of us would be concerned to deny these results. I can only record my own impression that the qualification contained in the words Dr. Garvie translates —'in so doing it has brought about a revolution in relation to the culture of the last centuries, the moral and religious reach of which cannot yet be estimated'—covers a very large doubt indeed in the mind of a man who writes a book on the scale of this '*Geschichte*' precisely to help present-day theology to link up profitably with the theological culture of the past after the Barthian interruption.

JAMES BROWN.

Colmonell.

These references, which I must have noticed as I read, must have escaped my memory when I wrote the review, and the absence of the name from the index misled me. I am grateful to Mr. Brown for calling attention to them.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

Entre Nous.

'The Expository Times.'

Readers will note this month that the magazine is reduced in size from 48 pages to 40 pages. The publishers have postponed this reduction as long as possible, but the extension of the War to Norway has added so much to the paper difficulty that it is now inevitable. Every effort will be made to include all the usual items and to make the most of all available space.

Claude Goldsmid Montefiore.

Shortly before his death the Right Hon. H. A. L. Fisher wrote a delightful Foreword to Miss Lucy Cohen's *Recollections of Claude Goldsmid Montefiore* (Faber & Faber; 12s. 6d. net):

'Nothing is so uncommon in this world as religious genius. Some few only having this deep inward grace of the soul are known to me and one of them was Claude. Despite great affluence and famous lineage, and though he was always much involved in practical affairs, he was a saint. Religion was his life, profound, exalted, and all pervading, and this his friends could not help always feeling, far withdrawn as were his deepest thoughts on the deepest things. . . . The influence of Benjamin Jowett, which had powerfully affected him ever since he came up to Balliol as an undergraduate, no doubt combined with the proclivities of a naturally liberal mind to bring him on to that high table-land where all religions meet, so that he found kindred spirits—men such as James Martineau and Hastings Rashdall and Von Hügel—in many churches other than his own. . . . His own task was to break down the barriers which separated Jew from Christian, to show the Jews what they might learn from the New Testament, and to teach the Christians what depths of religious truths and beauty might be found, not only in the Old Testament, but also in the Rabbinical literature of the Middle Ages.'

Claude Montefiore belonged to some of the foremost Jewish families. His father was a Montefiore; his mother a Goldsmid, and his grandmother a

Rothschild. Born on the 6th June 1858, he was delicate for many years and was educated privately; he went in 1878 to Balliol College, Oxford, where he was greatly influenced by A. C. Bradley and R. L. Nettleship. When he left Oxford he found it impossible to follow the calling of an orthodox Rabbi as he had intended. He became a leader of Liberal Judaism in this country. Montefiore wrote prolifically—six pages of the volume are occupied with the lists of his books, lectures, essays, reviews, and papers. Miss Cohen's memoirs deal very little with this or indeed with Montefiore's public life. They give rather a picture of his everyday life, his friendships ('I do not wobble in my affections'), and his sense of humour. Miss Cohen was his contemporary—she is his second cousin—and she had many letters from him, and quotations from these fill a considerable part of the volume.

Montefiore's hope was for the assimilation of the Jews with the peoples of the countries of their birth, their only distinction to be that of religion. He was much opposed to Jewish nationalism, and saw clearly that it would only lead to greater anti-Semitism. 'He did not wish for any Jewish State; he felt himself to be so much of an Englishman that he wished to owe allegiance to no other state. Why should not the Jews be a purely religious body? Yet on his death one of the Zionist papers wrote a eulogy of him, adding that in spite of his known opposition to the cause he was one of the first men to enclose a cheque after the riots, with the remark that help would no doubt be required to repair their ravages.'

Few men have been more generous than Montefiore. 'I feel it incumbent,' he once said, 'as a Jew, to do just a little more than is absolutely necessary.' It was a pain to him if any other wealthy Jews did not act in like manner.

Fraudulent Mendicity.

Readers will have noticed in *The Times* a series of letters on street begging and the best way of dealing with the evil, it being generally realized that many applicants are unworthy of help. But it does not seem to have occurred to any correspondent to cite the Gospel and Rabbinic views about this matter. They would seem to have been in agreement that help must be given. This surely is the meaning of the saying which was afterwards so distorted, 'lend freely, never despairing.' And on the Rabbinic side we meet very frequently with the following: 'we must be grateful for fraudulent beggars and show charity even to deceivers, for if it were not for them a man might be asked for alms by a genuinely poor man and he might refuse. How dreadful would his guilt then be'!

Nevertheless, the Council of Social Service might find much to learn in the relief provisions of the Early Church and of the Rabbis: for the latter, see the chapter on Charity in Montefiore and Loewe's *Rabbinic Anthology*.

HERBERT LOEWE.

Cambridge.

Creed or Chaos.

'The thing that is in danger is the whole structure of society, and it is necessary to persuade thinking men and women of the vital and intimate connexion between the structure of society and the theological doctrines of Christianity.

'The task is not made easier by the obstinate refusal of a great body of nominal Christians, both lay and clerical, to face the theological question. "Take away theology and give us some nice religion" has been a popular slogan for so long that we are apt to accept it, without inquiring whether religion without theology has any meaning. And however unpopular I may make myself, I shall and will affirm that the reason why the Churches are discredited to-day is, not that they are too bigoted about theology, but that they have run away from theology.

'Between Humanism and Christianity and between Paganism and Theism there is no distinction whatever, except a distinction of dogma. That you cannot have Christian principles without Christ is becoming increasingly clear, because their validity as principles depends on Christ's authority; and the Totalitarian States, having ceased to believe in Christ's authority, are logically quite justified in repudiating Christian principles. If "the average man" is required to "believe in Christ," and accept His authority for "Christian principles," it is surely relevant to inquire who or what Christ is, and why His authority should be accepted. But the question, "What think ye of Christ?" lands the average man at once in the very knottiest kind of dogmatic riddle. It is quite useless to say that it doesn't matter particularly who or what Christ was, or by what authority He did those things, and that even if He was only a man, He was a very nice man, and we ought to live by His principles: for that is merely Humanism, and if the "average man" in Germany chooses to think that Hitler is a nicer sort of man with still more attractive principles, the Christian Humanist has no answer to make.'[1]

[1] Dorothy Sayers, speaking at Derby on 4th May—Church Tutorial Classes Association.

Power.

In 1929 a book was published which became a best-seller in America. It told the story of a certain Dr. Hudson who tried to obey literally the Gospel teaching. We gave some account of 'Magnificent Obsession' in 'Entre Nous' at that date, recounting the story of Dr. Hudson's death.

Just ten years after this the author, Mr. Lloyd C. Douglas has published another religious novel which purports to be a translation of *Doctor Hudson's Secret Journal* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net) telling how the philosophy of power that he lived by came to him, and how it affected his life and the lives of others that he encountered in his work as a brain-specialist and as head of a large hospital.

The story begins with Dr. Hudson's meeting with a brilliant sculptor who told him that he himself 'had victory.' 'I now have everything I want and can do anything I wish! so can you! so can anybody! all you have to do is follow the rules!' He showed him a page from the New Testament, 'You will notice there,' pointing to the page in my hand, 'that this first step towards the achievement of power is an expansion—a projection of one's self into other personalities . . . you have to do it so stealthily that even your own left hand——.' The sculptor went on to tell Dr. Hudson how, after fulfilling all the conditions required of him for receiving power, he asked and received the capacity to do a creditable work of statuary, and so Dr. Hudson decided too on a new way of life, and learned that the secret of it was service stealthily done, and hidden sacrifice.

This way of 'making investments' in others spread. Dr. Hudson 'invested' in a younger colleague—Tim Watson, and he again in others.

'You will credit me, I hope, with a fair attempt to explain Watson's youthful arrival at a high rating in his profession, on the ground of his exceptional opportunities—plus his alert mind and indefatigable diligence. My own belief is, however, that all these fortunate factors in combination could not have made Watson what he is to-day without another's upbuilding. Tim unquestionably has the inner glow—or whatever this peculiar radiance may be called—that is to be had by one means only.

'This strange motivation began to show up in him about a year ago last September. He never confided anything about it to me, but I think he knew that I knew that he knew, judging from chance remarks that tumbled accidentally into our intimate conversations. That he was making sacrifices on somebody's behalf was apparent. His modest stipend from the hospital was going somewhere; for he never had any money, never went any place, had no social life at all; yet seemed smugly satisfied to live on nothing, and could stand any amount of chaffing about his parsimony.'

Self-respect.

There is nothing worse that can be done to an individual than the destruction of his self-respect. Of course, if he wrongs you, it is just and right that he make amends. But I think great care should be exercised that his personal pride is not destroyed. In the heat of passion, you may get some satisfaction from seeing him down on all fours with his chin in the mud, confessing that he is a lousy scoundrel, unfit for association with decent men. But the trouble is that after you have done that to him he has nothing more to lose; and a man who has nothing to lose makes a very mean antagonist.[1]

There is One God.

'"Mother," he said, "I too have a God. You would hardly be able to understand Him, even if I tried to explain Him to you." . . . "My God is the young, vigorous Christ. He is the young man's noblest conception of life and eternity. He opens the way and leads to victory. He punishes only with an understanding smile, and He forgives everything. He does not force us to our knees but lifts us up, and you can look on Him as a comrade. Something like that, Mother, is my notion of Christ, and I know that He will lead me to victory." . . . At the same time she was happy that her son at least had a faith; so she only said very quietly, "There is one God, but He reveals Himself in many forms—to you in this form simply because you can understand His existence better that way."'[2]

[1] *Doctor Hudson's Secret Journal*, 199.

[2] The story of several generations of the same family and of their struggles is told, in *The House of Markku*, by Unto Seppänen, the great Finnish novelist. The quotation is from the newly translated English edition (p. 457).

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.